THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. III SEPTEMBER, 1921 No. 15

EDITORIAL

A writer in the present number claims it as the good fortune of theology, "that the amateur can enter the lists with the professional without being hopelessly handicapped by his amateurism." The claim is an interesting one. Take only the last century or so, and at least three great names stand out in English history to vindicate it. There is Coleridge, who was by trade a man of letters; Gladstone, the greatest Finance Minister of his time; Browning, the poet. All were amateurs, in the sense that theology was never their main work, and their training for it was simply the width of their reading and the divine fire in their souls. Yet all were theologians. Coleridge was one of the great formative influences in Tractarian theology; to Gladstone's learning in sacred studies the hostel and library of St. Deiniol's, Hawarden, are an enduring monument; while there are few writers to-day on Christian Theism or on the Incarnation who can dispense with a quotation from Browning.

The list could be immeasurably enlarged, especially if we included those like St. Ambrose in early times—*raptus a tribunalibus ad sacerdotium*—or Blaise Pascal in later, who made their mark in other studies before turning attention especially to divinity. And it is interesting to note in what the appeal of theology chiefly consists, so far as minds of this kind are concerned. It is in the positive ideas of Christian tradition—its dogma, in fact. Life in the world of men and letters has taught them the immense potency of defined thoughts. They approach them, not as theses to be defended or impugned, but with the more liberal aim of seeing what can be made of them. They are never academic. A pragmatic judgment tells them that these ideas have not survived in human life and experience without some strong element of truth; and they wish to disentangle the element which has most force for their own minds, and present it afresh to their own generation. It is often claimed that, when criticism has cleared the ground of Christian dogma, the best minds of our time will again be employed in theology. All experience indicates the absurdity of this claim. You do not make peace by creating a desert.

RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY—ITS GROUNDS IN HUMAN EXPERIENCE

I

THE purpose of this paper is to discuss a part only of the problem connected with authority in religion. The part of the problem with which we are concerned is the question of how far the justification of the pronouncements of religious authority may be found in human experience; in other words, it is the problem of the empirical basis of religious authority. An entirely different method of attempting its justification is possible. We might leave on one side the experience of men and attempt to show by the *a priori* methods of pure reason the essential rightness of the claim to our obedience of the authority with whose defence we are concerned. This we may call the problem of the rationalistic basis of religious authority.

It is necessary here to make a distinction in order to avoid being misunderstood. The word "empiricism" has been applied both to a method in thought and to a philosophical dogma. The empirical method is that followed by the mind which tries to build up its knowledge from experienced facts. It is the method of all science. Empiricism as a dogma states that this is the only valid method of obtaining knowledge. This paper will follow the empirical method, but with the question of whether or not this is the only valid method it is not concerned. The empirical method remains of value, if the empirical dogma be false.

During the last two centuries the rationalistic method of thought has increasingly lost its power of convincing men, and the appeal to experience has in consequence become more usual as a method of enquiry. There are several reasons for this. Although the *a priori* method promises certainty and points out that no empirical method can give us knowledge of more than a high degree of probability; yet the empiricist may retort with effect that this advantage is more than counterbalanced by the sterility of rationalism in results of practical value and the almost total absence of agreement amongst the *a priori* philosophers themselves.

The empiricist may accept the dictum of certain philosophers that if the apodictic certainty required by rationalistic philosophy be insisted on, then it is possible to know very little of the objects of religion. He may agree with them that every

metaphysical proof of the existence of God or of the immortality of the soul can be shown to be inconclusive. He need not, however, admit that this result of metaphysical enquiry is disastrous. As a man's attitude towards religious problems becomes more practical and less academic, the attractiveness of this somewhat artificial requirement of apodictic certainty becomes less. Even if it be true that the existence of God cannot be proved by any *a priori* method and that no other method will give us absolute certainty, it is equally true that the existence of God can never be disproved with any greater certainty.

Meanwhile he has what William James calls the " forced choice " in his practical life of behaving as if there were a God or as if there were not. It is primarily to this practical necessity and not to any interest of pure thought that it is the function of religious authority to minister. So we turn to the empirical method to see what indications it provides to help us to make the right choice. If the philosopher tells us that, at best, we are only able to obtain from experience knowledge of a high degree of probability, this is a limitation which holds of all the knowledge on which our practical life is founded. It is only the metaphysician who can by *a priori* reasoning satisfy himself of the reality of the external world who is quite certain that he is not the victim of a vast illusion If we regard religion as primarily a practical matter, as a mode of activity rather than a system of theories, we shall not suppose that we have wasted time spent in obtaining about it the same kind of knowledge as we have about the world with which we have practical relations.

A certain metaphysician has said that though many people suppose themselves to have a religion, no one has a right to his religion until he has studied enough philosophy to be able to prove its truth. This remark seems to betray an unduly academic attitude. The practical man will find it no less absurd than a similar objection that he has no right to fall in love unless his philosophy can demonstrate the existence of other people, or even to eat his dinner until he can prove the reality of the external world.

Before discussing the problem of the basis in human experience of authority in religion, it is necessary to indicate what meaning will be attached to each of these terms. By authority will be meant the whole system of forces supplied by his fellow-men which influences a man's thoughts and actions. The most conspicuous of these forces is outside religion and is, of course, the organized authority of the law, which concerns itself mainly with the repression of courses of action which are flagrantly anti-social. It is not generally concerned with a man's belief except in so far as that is liable to result in action.

Ecclesiastical law, however, goes farther than this and claims some control over his beliefs.

Not less powerful than such codified authority is the intangible but compelling force of the general opinion of the society to which an individual belongs. This exercises a tyrannical supervision of his most trivial actions, a control which cannot be violated to any great extent except by a man of exceptional strength of character.

It will be convenient to distinguish between these two constituents of the social forces which make up the authority limiting the individual's freedom as "organized" and "unorganized" authority respectively.

We must next decide what we shall mean by human experience. There is a choice between two possible meanings of experience, a narrower and a wider one. In its narrowest sense, we may take it to include simply the conscious concomitant of our religious activities—what is generally called "religious experience." But by so doing we shall be excluding a large part of the empirical basis of religion. In order to avoid this, we may take human experience to include not merely "religious experience" in the restricted sense, but all of those things in the outside world and in a man's relations with his fellows which have in fact a bearing on his religious behaviour. We thus include under "human experience" not merely the psychical facts open to the individual's own introspection, but also certain of the facts studied in such sciences as anthropology and psychology. We make the grounds in human experience of religion coextensive with its whole empirical basis.

What then is the problem of the grounds in human experience of authority in religion?

From whatever point of view we may regard religion, we must suppose that, in its earliest stages at least, the genesis of its cults and dogmas was from experience. No *a priori* chain of reasoning determined primitive man's belief in the higher powers with whom he felt that he had relations. This belief grew out of his experience of the world of sense, of his own mental life, and of the social life of his tribe. All anthropologists' theories of religion agree in this. They differ only in which parts of experience they emphasize. We may then, as scientific investigators of religion, regard religious beliefs and practices as products of experience without considering at all the question of their truth and value. In discussing religious authority, however, we must go farther than this and enquire into a question which is of the first importance to religious authority—the question of how far this grounding in experience

is a testimony to the truth or to the value of these beliefs and practices.

We must, of course, avoid a one-sided emphasis on experience as the agent. Actually beliefs and cults have reacted on experience as well as experience on the beliefs and cults. The religious experience of a Catholic worshipper at the Mass is different from that of a Protestant who has a different rite and a different belief about it. It must, however, be admitted that neither a belief nor a cult can have a continued, living existence unless it is grounded in human experience—that is, unless it has a meaning for the individuals who accept it, and in some way helps them to co-ordinate their own experiences. Religious authority will, therefore, be permanently successful only in claiming allegiance to such beliefs and practices as are grounded in human experience.

One is tempted to contrast a religious authority which is thus grounded with an oracular authority which has no deeper grounding than in the self-supporting testimony of its own affirmations and in the stability of its prestige. Yet it would not be consistent with the terminology adopted in this paper to say that such authority, when it is accepted, has no grounding in human experience. The consciousness of the prestige and of the weight of the authority which makes a claim on their allegiance is a part of that experience on which men's religious beliefs rest. The practical unsatisfactoriness of oracular authority is the result of the fact that (in addition to its possible intellectual weakness) it makes its appeal to this one type of experience only, and may fail to satisfy the demands of other types. It is a familiar fact that a religion founded on an acceptance of authority of this kind shows its weakness when the individual is faced with experience of a different kind which forces itself on his attention—with intense emotional religious experience, or with a deep experience of pain.

The problem of this paper divides itself naturally into two parts, one psychological and the other philosophical. The first part is the attempt to trace the roots in human experience of the beliefs and practices which it is the object of religious authority to enforce, simply as a psychological problem without considering the value of this experience as a guide to truth. The other is the more serious question of how far the grounding of such beliefs and practices in human experience is a guide to their truth. Religious authority cannot be sustained merely by an appeal to the usefulness or devotional value of its requirements. Experience shows that a cult which is pursued merely for its devotional value by worshippers who have ceased to believe in the reality of the objects towards which the cult

is directed, loses even that devotional value for which it is pursued. We must ask, therefore, whether human experience provides any sort of evidence for the validity of the religious beliefs which spring from it.

In this discussion, I shall treat these two questions together, trying to show how particular beliefs and practices of religion have, in fact, their roots in human experience, and, at the same time, asking how far the particular experience from which they spring bears any testimony to their truth. A preliminary question which must be discussed is the philosophical one of how far a general basis in experience can be used as evidence for the validity of the beliefs concerned. This raises the question of our criteria of truth.

The position I wish to defend is that the power to rationalize —that is, to give a coherent, intelligible, and reasonably simple account of—experience is a criterion, however imperfect, of the truth of a religious doctrine. It is necessary here to make a clear distinction between this position and that of the later pragmatists, who would consider that the truth of a doctrine is simply its power to rationalize experience, and that any question of its relation to an objective reality is meaningless. The position here maintained is that a doctrine rationalizes experience because it has, certainly in a limited and relative way, that relation to an objective reality which we call " truth."

This, we may notice, is the criterion used to test the truth of a scientific theory. The atomic theory of Dalton was originated because it gave a coherent and intelligible account of a certain number of scientific facts of which the idea of an infinitely divisible matter gave no explanation or with which it could only be reconciled by a large number of arbitrary and complicated assumptions. Such facts were the following: the law of combination in definite proportions, the law of multiple proportions, and the law of combination in simple proportions by volume. This theory has also shown its power to rationalize other facts not known to its discoverer. Such are: the rates of diffusion of gases, the connection between the abnormal molecular weights of electrolytes in solution and the electrical conductivity of these solutions, and the success of Van der Waals' correction of Boyle's law. Both its power of rationalizing the facts known to its originator, and still more its power of rationalizing later discoveries, give us reason for supposing that it possesses a real though perhaps partial insight into truth. We feel confident that, whatever new discoveries about the constitution of matter may be made (such as those embodied in the electronic theory), the conception of discrete (though not necessarily indivisible) particles

is nearer the real nature of matter than would be the alternative theory.

It is necessary, however, to face fairly the weaknesses and defects of this criterion, which are the weaknesses and defects of the empirical method itself. Particular experiences may be illusory, the simple and intelligible explanation to which they appear to point may not be the true one. Thus the simple rationalization of monitory voices is that the subject is in communication with a spirit, but a more careful psychological investigation may lead us to conclude that they are really received from the unconscious levels of his own mind. The appearance of purpose in the construction of organisms is rationalized in a simple and satisfactory way by the assumption of an intelligent creator, but it may be argued that this appearance can be the effect of mechanical causes acting under particular conditions. It is not, therefore, sufficient to accept the most satisfactory rationalization of any particular experience. It is also necessary to ask what is the probability that it is really due to some other cause, that its apparent indication of the simple rationalization is an illusion. When, however, different experiences covering a wide range point to rationalizations which are all essentially the same, the probability of error becomes less. The probability of error is, in fact, equal to the product of the probabilities of illusion in each particular case. But, however small we may consider this probability to be, it cannot be zero. We can have a high degree of probability that the concordant indications of a wide range of experience are not entirely illusory, but we cannot have metaphysical certainty. At the same time, we have no reason for supposing that the truths we have reached are absolute, any more than we have in the case of the atomic theory. A wider experience has shown that it is necessary to modify that theory and to regard the atom, not as an indivisible unit, but as a system of negatively charged particles rapidly moving in orbits around a positive nucleus. But this in no way alters the fact that the atomic theory contained a real advance in truth from earlier theories. But the truth arrived at was not absolute and final. This fact might have been illustrated equally well by the Newtonian physics and the theory of relativity. In the same way, there is no reason for claiming finality in religious doctrines; but so far as they are legitimate rationalizations from experience, later experience may be expected to modify but not overthrow these earlier rationalizations.

It will be convenient to produce some order in the mass of experience which may bear on authority in religion by considering it under four main headings.

The first of these includes the historical facts on which a particular religion rests. In Christianity, these are: the condition of the Jewish monotheism from which Christianity was born; the narratives of the life, teaching, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ; and the growth of the Christian community. In addition to these, we must consider the relation of Christianity, historically and psychologically, to other religions as this is revealed in the science of comparative religions.

The second kind of experience which may be relevant to authority in religion is that which includes the facts which are dealt with by science. It may be described as the experience of external reality. The most familiar case in which the experience of external reality has been used as a support for authority in religion is probably the famous argument from design. All such methods of approach to religion are now generally supposed to be entirely discredited, but this wholesale condemnation may be too severe. There can be little doubt that one of the psychological roots of religious belief is in the conviction of men that they could see in the universe the marks of the handiwork of a personal creator, and our philosophical discussion cannot be complete unless it includes a consideration of the question of whether this conviction is quite certainly an illusion.

Thirdly, we must consider the facts of the moral life. In connection with these facts, we must ask first how far religion has roots in the experience of moral conflict; and secondly, whether the objectivity of the demands of the moral consciousness can give us any information about the existence of God or about His nature.

Lastly, there are what are generally called the facts of "religious experience." This term is used to include, not all experience which is relevant to religion, but only that part which is internal or subjective. Such experience is the sense of the presence of God, of the soul's union with Him, the feeling of grace received through sacrament or prayer, the sense of sin and of forgiveness. Such things are experienced at times by all religious persons, but they only attain a condition approaching permanence in the mystics. They have been very differently valued by different religious bodies. The Quakers, for example, set great store by what they call the "inner light"; while the tendency in official Roman Catholicism is to discourage such things as temptations to peculiarity and spiritual pride.

In my next article I propose to discuss these different elements of experience as constituent grounds of religious authority at somewhat greater length. It is necessary here to anticipate some of the results of that discussion.

The first problem for religious authority is: To what kind of supreme power does human experience point men: personal or impersonal, good or evil or indifferent to both? It will be seen that the facts of morality do not in themselves decide the first question, for Kant was led by them to a conception of God which was not personal. The facts of the external world seem, if we take account of the element of purpose, to point more definitely to a personal God; but even here to many persons caprice seems to rule to such an extent that they have preferred to believe in a power which is impersonal and blind.

It is in normal (not mystical) religious experience that the demand for a personal God is met with most definitely. The object of religious experience is ordinarily clearly personal. It is someone whom we may love, to whom we may speak. The most striking affective change in conversion is often to a sudden realization of the personality of God. Thus Evan Roberts, the Welsh revivalist, says after his conversion: "I was taken up into a great expanse without time or space—it was communion with God. Before that it was a far-off God that I had."

The evidence of the history of Christianity tends in the same direction. The God of whom Jesus Christ speaks is personal, for He taught His disciples to make petitions to God using the words "Our Father." This is even clearer in the Early Church, since they regarded Jesus Christ as God incarnate.

If we turn to the data of Comparative Religion, we find the development, side by side, of an idea of religion in which the gods are personal spirits—animism, with another idea in which an impersonal spiritual force is the dominant conception. All the more developed religions have roots in both of these ideas, but all of the great popular religions of the world (with the exception of original Buddhism) are centred either round a personal God or gods, or round personal spirits. The case of Buddhism is particularly instructive. Starting without any god, it has been forced by the needs of its worshippers to make the Buddha deified the practical centre of that popular form of the cult which counts its millions of adherents.

A survey of the widest possible range of human experience leads us to the conclusion that pragmatically the most satisfactory postulate for religion is the existence of a personal God. This may mean no more than that if there were no personal God, it would be necessary to invent one, in order to provide a satisfactory explanation of the various experiences which man tries to rationalize in his religion.

In the interests of religious authority, we must further enquire into the truth of this postulate. This is necessary because religious authority must have fundamental hypotheses

which are accepted as true and not merely as useful. In this discussion, we leave on one side the *a priori* metaphysical treatment of religious doctrines. This neglect is because they are not relevant to the particular treatment of the subject which has been chosen in this article, not because they are regarded as invalid. They may, indeed, be essential; it may be impossible to find a satisfactory basis for religious authority in human experience alone.

The answer to this enquiry has already been suggested earlier in this paper. It was maintained that the power to rationalize experience which makes a religious postulate pragmatically satisfactory is also a criterion of its truth. The probability that it is a valid criterion in any particular case will depend in the manner already indicated on the width of the experience considered and on the probability of error in our rationalization in each particular part of it. The empirical method cannot give us apodictic certainty, but for practical purposes it is sufficient that we should have a high degree of probability that our religious hypotheses are true.

The religious hypothesis which has so far been discussed is that of the existence of a personal God. If this be accepted, our treatment of other religious questions must be guided by similar considerations. We may consider the question of the Incarnation. We must ask whether it satisfies any form of religious experience, whether any appeal can be made to the facts of the external world, and whether it solves any difficulties raised by moral experience; as well as its relation to the gospel narrative and to the history of religions.

What, for example, is its relation to the religious experience which strives to express itself in the belief that man's spirit is perfect in its potentialities though it is lamentably imperfect in its performance? How does our experience of pain in the external world fit in with the idea of God Himself becoming part of that world and sharing its pain? What is the significance for the doctrine of the Incarnation of the numerous incarnations which a study of comparative religions reveals in other systems? I must be content thus to point out the lines of thought by which an authority founded on empirical theology might be defended for its doctrine of the Incarnation. In my next paper, I intend to try to sketch more fully the elements of an empirical justification of the central article of faith for any empirical religion—the existence of a personal God.

ROBERT H. THOULESS.

(*To be continued.*)

CHOIRS AND CHOIR SCHOOLS SINCE THE REFORMATION

I. DECLINE

DURING the two centuries immediately preceding the Reformation, musical services were advancing in popularity in our parish churches. To this period is generally assigned the formation of a National school of music, and the Church came under the influence of the new movement. Her talented children were allowed ample scope for the cultivation of their gifts in the service of religion, and with ecclesiastical patronage and support there was a rapid increase in the number of choirs. To the ordinary church services were added the mystery plays, for the clergy knew by experience the educational value of the religious drama. This proved an excellent medium for instructing ignorant and illiterate people. Legends of the saints and well-known Bible stories were in this way presented in a form which could be readily grasped by the meanest intelligence. Parish church choirs thus became a very important part of the Church organization, and their utility accounts for their increasing popularity.

Cathedral choirs took a leading part in these mystery plays, and when the old order passed away, the dramatic instincts of the children found expression in entertainments of a more secular character. In the reign of Henry VIII. the children of St. Paul's performed before the King, and his no less distinguished daughter Queen Elizabeth encouraged the boys to do the same in her reign. At that time bands of strolling actors were going about the country, and sometimes they came to London. Improvised wooden platforms were erected at the principal London inns for the use of these players. The Mayor and Corporation were not kindly disposed towards these parties, and they were expelled from the city in 1575. An exception was made in favour of certain companies patronized by lords of the Council, and of the two companies of the "Children of the Chapel Royal" and the "Children of St. Paul's." The latter used Blackfriars Theatre (at that time the most select playhouse) until 1581, when they gave their performances at the singing school at St. Paul's. Their successors at Blackfriars were the "Children of the Chapel Royal." Numerous plays were given by the "Children," of which the following are examples:

Titus and Gisippus, The Historye of: Shewen at Whitehall on Shrove Tuysdaie at night, enacted by the Children of Paules. 1576.

Endimion, and the Man in the Moone: Acted before Queen Elizabeth at Greenwich; printed in 1591.

Abuses: 30 July 1606, before James I. and the King of Denmark. "The youthes of Paules, commonly called the Children of Paules, plaide before the two kings a play called *Abuses*, containing both a comedie and a tragedie, at which the Kinges seemed to take delight, and be much pleased."

This harmless form of amusement could not be tolerated when the Puritan influence was in the ascendancy. Then indulgence in stage plays was considered a highly improper pastime for choristers. This change of mind is indicated in the instructions given in 1626 to a commission for selecting singing boys for the Royal Chapels:

"We do straightly charge and command, that none of the said Choristers . . . shall be used or imployed as Comedians or Stage Players, or to exercise or acte any Stage plaies, Interludes, Comedies, or Tragedies, for that it is not fitt or desent that such as should sing the praises of God Almighty should be trained or imployed in such lascivious or profane exercises."

The following belongs to the restored and present Choristers' School at St. Paul's:

King Marigold: Words by the Rev. H. C. Shuttleworth music (not printed) by the Rev. W. Russell; acted at St. Paul's Choir School. Christmas, 1877.*

But to return from this digression. Although ecclesiastical music became increasingly popular in parish churches, its true home is to be found among the trained and professional choirs. These date from the earliest period of English Church history. Every monastery was a school of music; here the clergy received a musical training, and boy choristers assisted in the rendering of the services. Cathedrals had their song schools as well as their grammar schools with special endowments for the maintenance of the choirs. About 1322 Pope John XXII. issued a decree complaining about the elaborate music of his time; the old plainsong chants were in his opinion far more ecclesiastical and ought to be restored. Evidently the decree did not have the desired effect, for composers continued to write music in the new style.

About this time kings and princes gathered around them skilled musicians and singers, who accompanied them on their journeys, and formed the choirs in their own chapels. Henry V. had a "complete chapel full of singers"; while Henry VI. showed his interest by contributing some of his own compositions, to be sung in his chapel at Windsor. In the household of

* These extracts are quoted from W. Sparrow Simpson's *Gleanings from Old St. Paul's.*

Edward IV., there were twenty-four chaplains and clerks, skilled in discant, two epistlers (ex-chorister boys), eight children, and a Master of the Children. The children lived in the royal palace and received daily, "two loaves, one messe of greate meate, ij galones of ale." They attended the King when he was travelling, and when their voices changed were sent to study at Oxford or Cambridge "tylle the King may otherwise advance them." The advantages of these choirs were sufficient to attract the best musical talent of the day. In 1526 Cardinal Wolsey provided that when King Henry VIII. was on his journey he should be accompanied by a choir of six men and six boys, who were to sing Mass every morning and an anthem every afternoon. The Venetian ambassador at Henry's Court described the services there in terms of the highest praise: "The Mass was sung by His Majesty's choristers, whose voices are more heavenly than human. They did not chant like men, but gave praise like angels."

The Reformation has been described as the deformation of Church music. This is unfortunately true, but it is only fair to add that this result was contrary to the mind and intention of the English Reformers. The great religious upheaval of the sixteenth century carried in its train consequences far greater than were at first foreseen; and the hand of the faction from Geneva is plainly discernible in the bulk of the destructive work wrought during these troublous times. Yet while these changes were taking place, the musical traditions were fully maintained at the Royal Court. Edward VI. had a choir of thirty-four singers and thirty-nine instrumentalists upon which he expended no less than £2,200 a year. Queen Elizabeth was another generous patron of music. As is well known, she loved pomp and display, and in the service in her chapel certain of the old traditional rites were retained. A cross stood on the altar, and every day there was fully choral Mattins and Evensong as in former years. The choir of men and boys were carefully chosen and included the finest talent in the kingdom. The Court set an example by showing what could be done under the new order. The crusade against Church music was the outcome of popular prejudice aggravated by the influence of foreign Protestantism of that especially virulent type which flourished in Geneva in the days of John Calvin.

Choral services were also continued in the Cathedrals. The services were now in English instead of Latin, but they were rendered in the accustomed way by professional choirs. Henry VIII., believing firmly in the importance of education, extended his support to all schools and colleges. This policy in the main safeguarded the endowments for the maintenance

and education of choristers. He also desired that the example of the Chapel Royal should be followed at least in those churches which were the centres of diocesan life. In days when every monastery was a school of music, the dissolution of the religious houses resulted in grievous loss to the Church. A few of these houses were converted into Cathedrals, and there at least the song schools were still maintained. The monks were replaced by lay clerks, as the male choirmen were called in those days, and the boys, boarded and educated as in former times, retained their places as members of the cathedral choir.

When the English Prayer-Book was introduced, a musical edition was needed for the use of choirs. This was undertaken by John Merbecke, Master of the Choristers at St. George's, Windsor. In 1550 he published *The Boke of Common Praier noted*. This book contained directions for the rendering of Mattins, Evensong, the Holy Communion and Burial Services. It was prepared for use at the Chapel Royal, but it was soon adopted as the authorized musical edition of the new Book of Common Prayer. The book thus set a standard, and can be taken as an indication of the mind and intention of the English Reformers in respect of the choral services.

A noteworthy feature of the new order was the omission of the old Office hymns. Cranmer wanted to translate these hymns into the vernacular, but none of the Reformers felt themselves competent to undertake the task. The loss of this popular feature of religious worship contributed in no small measure to the decline of general interest in sacred music. No doubt there were certain uncompromising Protestants who vetoed all kinds of music, but their influence would have been considerably weakened had there been more adequate opportunities for congregational singing. Various attempts were made to supply this deficiency, but Churchfolk had to wait nearly two and a half centuries before their old hymns were restored to them. Metrical versions of the Psalms took the place of hymns until the early years of the nineteenth century, when Richard Mant, Rector of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, and afterwards Bishop of Killaloe, went through the Roman Breviary and provided English versions of the majority of the hymns he found there. Collections of English hymns had appeared ere this, but the revival of the use of hymns in public worship belongs to the story of the great religious awakening for which the nineteenth century will ever be famous.

In Germany at the time of the Reformation, the people already possessed a selection of hymns in the vernacular. Luther found societies in existence for the promotion of congregational singing. Translation of certain hymns had been under-

taken by the clergy of the Middle Ages and set to popular folk-melodies. Luther enriched this storehouse of sacred song, partly by the translation of additional hymns and partly by new compositions. Luther, moreover, was a lover of music. The early years of his life were spent in a monastic school, and he knew the value of these institutions as educational foundations. When the time came for the suppression of the religious houses and the alienation of the endowments, these schools became the objects of his particular interest. Appeals were addressed alike to the civic authorities and to the wealthy citizens, and they were not made in vain. The old choir schools were retained and remodelled, and in some parishes as many as fifty boys and youths were provided for. These pupils were called *alumni;* they all received a thorough musical training with instruction in both singing and instrumental music. This training was continued when they passed to the higher schools and Universities, with the result that the *alumni* became competent musicians. Under these favourable conditions, there was ample scope for the development of choral culture. The *alumni* soon distinguished themselves by their marked ability, and their concert parties were in considerable demand in private houses and elsewhere. During the greater part of the eighteenth century the chorus for the Grand Opera at Dresden was made up of the *alumni* from the School of the Holy Cross. Unfortunately the official connection with the Church was not maintained, and in course of time they became independent choral societies. Still they remained a valuable source of supply for filling the ranks of church choirs and augmenting them on the occasion of important festivals. This development from an ordinary choir school is worthy of mention. All the Reformers did not share the prejudices of the small aggressive faction which vainly sought to destroy every trace of Catholic custom and order in this country. England did not stand alone in retaining her choir schools in the centres of Church life and organization.

There is an ordinance of Cardinal Pole dating from the period of the Marian reaction. Every metropolitan and cathedral church was required "to maintain a certain number of boys, or a kind of seminary." Preference was to be given to poor scholars, and instruction was to be given in reading and writing. The school was to be open to other scholars, presumably on payment of certain fees. This ordinance suggests negligence on the part of some Cathedral bodies, but during the troublous days of Edward VI. it would have been surprising had everything gone smoothly. Even under more favourable circumstances Cathedral bodies have not always been noted for the conscientious performance of their duties. On the other

hand, choir schools as a whole have had a continuous history. There were certain musicians who were able to adapt themselves to the successive changes under Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth. An elastic conscience was a possession of incalculable value in those days. At a time when the whole fabric of ecclesiastical order and administration was in process of reconstruction it is not surprising to find there were some who favoured a policy of submission to the " powers that be." Needless to say, these must have been men who did not share the strong and uncompromising convictions of the religious leaders. Christopher Tye was organist at Ely 1541–1562. He held this post throughout the principal changes of the period; ultimately he became a thoroughgoing supporter of the Reformation. He composed services and anthems, and also published a metrical version of the first fourteen chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. Thomas Tallys was organist at Waltham Abbey until the dissolution. He was then appointed one of the gentlemen of the Chapel Royal, which post he retained until his death in 1585. As a composer Tallys wrote both for the Latin and English services, but he is best known to present-day Churchmen through his harmonized settings to the Responses and Litany. Perhaps his sympathies were with the old order, but he loyally accepted the changes, and stood in high favour with Queen Elizabeth, who granted to him and to his pupil William Byrd a valuable privilege: for twenty-one years the publication of all music and music paper was entirely in their hands.

When Dean Colet refounded St. Paul's School, separate arrangements were made for the Almonry boys, and their school became independent of the Grammar School. The property belonging to the choristers was not conveyed to the new foundation. The boys at Colet's School had an excellent education, and it would have saved the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's a great deal of trouble had they been allowed to send their boys there. In 1584 Dean Nowell made application on behalf of the choristers, and the request was renewed in the following reign, when Archbishop Laud instructed the Chapter to make enquiries as to the rights of patronage in Dean Colet's school. The Governors refused to make any concessions in favour of the choristers, justifying their attitude by pointing out that the Chapter possessed ample endowments for the classical education of the choristers. Two centuries later, when called to account for their scandalous treatment of the boys, the Chapter pleaded in self-defence that liberal provision was already made for their classical education of the Cathedral boys. In blissful ignorance of past history, they seem to have regarded Dean Colet's School as an institution intended to supply what was lacking in their own educational curriculum.

At the time of the Reformation, the leading choir schools were those at the Chapel Royal and St. Paul's Cathedral. Although a great deal was done for the boys, a chorister's life was not always sufficiently attractive to secure a sufficient number of boys. Even at these premier schools it was necessary to resort to the custom of impressing boys for the service of the Church. The possession of a good voice was not always an advantage in days when the owner was liable to compulsory service in the choir. Among these boys was a certain Thomas Tusser, who narrated his experiences in verse:

"Thence for my voice, I must (no choice)
Away of forse like posting horse,
For sundry men had placards then
Such child to take.

"The better brest, the lesser rest
To serve the queere, now there now here;
For time so spent, I may repent,
And sorrow make."

This was in the days of John Redford, Organist of St. Paul's 1530–1547 and possibly later. A similar commission was given by Queen Elizabeth to Thomas Gyles, Master of the Children of St. Paul's in 1585:

"Wee therefore by the tenoure of these presents will and require you that ye permit and suffer from henceforthe our said servaunte Thomas Gyles and his deputy or deputies . . . to take up in anye Cathedrall or collegiate churches, and in every other place . . . suche childe and children as he or they . . . shall find and like of, and the same childe and children . . . to bring awaye without anye your lette, contradictions, staye or interruptions to the contrarie."

Incidentally the Commission is evidence of the Queen's resolve to maintain the standard of the Cathedral service at St. Paul's. Gyles evidently stood very high in the royal favour, for in 1595 his son Nathaniel Gyles was appointed organist and master of the choristers of St. George's, Windsor, at a salary of £81 6s. 8d., with a dwelling in the Castle. These children were frequently called upon to act before the Sovereign as well as to sing in church, and a very high standard of excellence was expected from them.

Choristers were not always on their best behaviour, nor was it considered unseemly for them to stop singing whenever anything happened to divert their attention. From very ancient times choristers were allowed to collect money from any visitor who entered the Cathedral wearing spurs. None were exempt, even the King having to pay forfeit if he offended against this unwritten law. The custom is referred to in a book dating

from the reign of James I.: "Be sure your silver spurs clog your heels, and then the boys will swarm about you like so many white butterflies." The following is an extract from a pamphlet published in 1598 with the significant title, *The Children of the Chapel Stript and Whipt*. The author had been shocked at the sights he had witnessed in Cathedrals, and considered that every "querister" should have a Testament in English and follow the lessons when they were read. This was far better than spending "theyr time in talk and hunting after 'spur money,' wheron they set theyr whole mindes, and do often abuse dyvers, if they doe not bestowe somewhat on them." Towards the close of the sixteenth century it was a cause of complaint that the children at St. George's, Windsor, were accustomed to leave off chanting to claim money from offenders. About the same time Bishop Bancroft in one of his visitations expressed his disapproval of similar and like practices in his own Cathedral; it was wrong for the young gentlemen of the choir to spend their "tyme in talk and hunting after spur money even in service tymes." Outside the hours of service the same young gentlemen were guilty of unseemly behaviour for their "hollowings and hootings above in the steeple were intollerable at dyvers tymes." It may here be explained that the jingling of the spurs interfered with the musical performances of the choir, so that the fine was a form of compensation payable by those who disturbed the harmonies of the choristers. The custom of claiming this money extended well into the nineteenth century. The Duke of Wellington was caught by the choristers of the Chapel Royal, and as late as 1847 the late Sir John Stainer, then a chorister at St. Paul's, was told that he was entitled to "spur money" if he could get it.

Until quite recent years, St. Paul's had a college of twelve minor canons. This number was reduced to six by the St. Paul's Minor Canonries Act of 1875. Of the original twelve, the second and third were called Senior and Junior Cardinals. These offices are still retained. They are peculiar to St. Paul's, and the duties include the general supervision of the Choir. The Cardinals were supposed to give weekly lessons in the Catechism and to report cases of bad conduct to the Dean. They were also to let him know the names of boys who did not profit by their instructions or who were negligent or stubborn. In olden times they were rewarded for their manifold labours with certain offerings of the faithful, and a larger portion of bread and beer.

With the downfall of King Charles and the victory of the Parliamentary party, all ecclesiastical institutions were in peril. Organs were removed, music books destroyed, and choirs

disbanded. The Puritans could not allow the House of God to be disfigured by choristers in white surplices; henceforward the boys must find employment "in ways less displeasing to Almighty God than singing His praise." Yet Martin Pierson the Almoner and Master of the choristers at St. Paul's Cathedral was allowed to retain his position and draw the emoluments of his office until his death in 1650. The Puritans even appointed a successor, Randolph Jewett, who also reaped the benefits of the endowments without fulfilling the corresponding duties. Having nothing to do in London he went to live at Winchester. At the Restoration the Dean and Chapter sent the absentee Almoner a gentle reminder, requiring his immediate presence in London. The mastership of the children was no longer a lucrative sinecure. The Puritan tyranny was over, the days of choral services were about to begin.

The task of reorganizing the suppressed choirs was, however, beset with difficulties. A generation had grown up ignorant of the Prayer-Book services, and when the use of the Book was revived the people had to be taught how to render the services. Edward Lowe wrote a book of instructions in 1661, and two years later James Clifford, a minor canon at St. Paul's, published *A Collection of Divine Services and Anthems usually sung in His Majesty's Chapel, and in all Collegiate Choirs of England and Ireland.* Besides the usual chants and musical directions, the book contained the words of 393 anthems.

For many years after the Restoration there was a great dearth of choristers; suitable boys were not forthcoming, and it taxed the ingenuity of choirmasters to supply the deficiency caused by the lack of treble voices. Men with feigned voices were employed at the Chapel Royal, while at Westminster Abbey a certain John Hill was retained for playing the treble parts upon the cornet (*i.e.*, an obsolete reed instrument not unlike an hautboy, often made of wood and covered with leather).

After 1666 "old St. Paul's" was no more. The Cathedral was destroyed in the Great Fire, and it was not until June 1875 that the foundation of the new Cathedral was laid. The choir was opened for divine service on December 2, 1697. The Almoner at that time was Jeremiah Clark, who had acquired a certain amount of celebrity as a composer. Compton, Bishop of London (1675–1713), ordered the *Sanctus* and the *Gloria in Excelsis* to be chanted by the choir, and settings to these portions of the Communion Service were found among Clark's papers. Evidently there were choral Eucharists at the restored Cathedral from the first. Clark came to an untimely end, dying by his own hand in 1707, and was succeeded by one of his pupils, Charles

King, who had married his daughter. King lived with the boys at a house in London House Yard; he composed several services, but his name is handed down to posterity as one who was extremely merciful to erring boys. Unlike the average master of his time, he was always sparing in his use of the birch rod. With him,

> "Indulgence ne'er was sought in vain,
> He never smote with stinging cane,
> He never stop't the penny fees,
> His boys were let do what they please."

The "penny fees" were payments of a penny a day to each chorister as pocket-money. These could be withheld if a boy's conduct was not altogether satisfactory.

King was succeeded by William Savage, who had the eight choristers at his house at Paul's Bakehouse Court. Hiring out boys for concert parties had by this time become an established custom, and this proved a fruitful source of revenue for the Almoner. No doubt the money was needed to supplement an inadequate income, but the toleration of this practice opened the door for gross abuses on the part of unscrupulous masters. Savage, on the whole, appears to have treated the boys with consideration, hiring a coach for them on the occasion of these concert parties. On the other hand, unlike King, he was not renowned for his leniency, and his severity led to his removal by the Dean and Chapter. Perhaps the laxity shown by King needed strong corrective measures to restore order and discipline among boys who had been accustomed "to do as they pleased." One of his boys was Jonathan Battishill, who joined the choir at the age of ten, and who, at the present day, is well known as a composer of Church music.

The first enthusiasm which followed the Restoration did not last long. Interest in church choirs was soon on the wane, and cathedral bodies during the eighteenth century were not famous for their zeal in maintaining the choral establishments at their full state of efficiency. They considered that the endowments could be more profitably employed in other ways, incidentally in augmenting their own incomes. There were of course notable exceptions. Henry Aldrich, Canon and afterwards Dean of Christ Church, Oxford (1682–1710), valued his choir, and kept in close personal touch with the members. He never admitted a boy unless he had received some musical training and already given evidence of his abilities. Every week the whole choir assembled at his house for a singing practice, and on these occasions the Dean took an active part in the proceedings. In his days, it is said, there was never a dearth of choristers at Christ Church, Oxford.

An interesting relic of mediæval days is still preserved at Lincoln Cathedral. The four leading choristers wear, instead of surplices, black cloth gowns with sleeves and white facings. These gowns are renewed every two years. The rest of the choir wear surplices and cassocks, but these four boys retain the distinctive dress which is supposed, by some authorities, to have had its origin in the choral cope sometimes worn in the Middle Ages. At Norwich the boys used to wear black cloth gowns on all ordinary days; on Sundays and Holy Days they appeared in surplices, but on other occasions their ecclesiastical robe was the gown, which, according to an ancient statute, had to be renewed once a year. This custom continued until the days of Dean Goulburn. At Salisbury the boys wear white cambric frills, and from the Cathedral the custom has extended to some of the churches in the diocese. One of the choristers at this Cathedral is called the "Bishop's Boy." The office had its origin in very ancient times. The boy is formally admitted by the Bishop, and before every service it is his duty to ascertain whether the Bishop is likely to be present. When he comes the boy walks before him, and generally sees that he has everything he wants. The survival of these old customs is one of the many links which bind the Church of to-day with the Church of the Middle Ages.

W. Escott Bloss.

(*To be concluded.*)

THE UNIQUE

The Uniformity of Nature is a fine phrase. It has captured the imagination. It appeals to the love of easy generalizations which is one of the besetting sins of armchair philosophers. It saves trouble; it sounds neat and rounded off; its parentage is quite respectable. Further, it has a good deal of truth in it. There *is*, happily for us, an order in things which we can perceive with sufficient clearness; otherwise all thought would be a mere nightmare. But Heaven help us if we ever get into the way of thinking we have perceived the whole, or even half of the above, or that we *can* perceive it, in the present state of our faculties. And Heaven preserve us from the Philosophy of the Ordinary—that is, from taking the Ordinary as the real criterion of the True. The Ordinary, with its uniformity, may make ordinary life more comfortable. It would be an uncomfortable world in which day did not succeed night with a commendable regularity that we could count upon, or hens lay eggs, or cows give milk, or steam engines perform their wonted and expected functions. Yet these are mere accessories of

life: they are not life itself. Again, inanimate things may easily fall into pigeon-holes, even when they are exceptions to a received rule. The Cullinan diamond is a diamond for all that, spite of its unusual size; it does not differ from other diamonds, save in glory. The Victoria Falls are still falls, though exceptionally big ones. They differ from other waterfalls merely in size, and in consequent grandeur of effect; they need no special category. Among animate things, the white elephant is an interesting variant on the ordinary beast which spells "elephant" to us. It is certainly more interesting and more arresting than the ordinary type. It is precisely this interest which constitutes its peculiar value. The Pigmy is an interesting anthropological problem solely because of its uniqueness. But neither Pigmies nor white elephants, still less Cullinan diamonds and Victoria Falls, have an important bearing on life itself. They are but interesting facts, which serve to fill in a background. Pigmies and white elephants might cease to exist: the world would be little the poorer. We could perfectly well spare Cullinan diamonds, and the Victoria Falls might be harnessed to dynamos and light half Africa. That would be a gain in some respects. It might cost the Falls their uniqueness of power and beauty. That would be a loss, but hardly a vital loss, to the world in general. These things touch only ordinary life, not real life. For ordinary life is not the real life. The real life is extraordinary, or it is nothing. It may even have to be unique in some of its aspects, that life as a whole may be full and perfect.

The Uniformity of Nature! Is it true in the case of the Arts? Or are the Arts no part of Nature? Then "Nature" is the poorer, and the term is violently misused. Pray, how do we judge of the Arts? Take the art of sculpture: do we judge of it by the specimens exhibited with conscientious annual regularity at Burlington House? Or do we not take Pheidias, Canova, Michael Angelo as our criteria? In short, do we regard Pheidias, Canova, Michael Angelo as freaks, strange outcrops from uniformity, or do we regard them as the norm, the real, the true, the "arrived," when we pass judgment upon the merits of a piece of sculpture? In music, again, is it the pretty compositions of ordinary cathedral organists, or of the men who write facilely for provincial orchestras, that set the standard, or is it the giants—Bach, Beethoven, Wagner, Saint-Saëns, Widor, Grieg, Tchaïkovsky, and the rest—that we take as the true models? Or, again, in literature, is it the ordinary journalist, or the poetaster, or the writer of sensational novels, or the theatre hack who strings together an effective part for an actor-manager, who set the standard? The Hundred Best Books! Can you get even a hundred out of

the whole range of the literature of the world? Perhaps you can, yet hardly more than a hundred, with all the centuries to draw upon. Yet "of the making of many books there is no end." Think of the scores and scores of writers! It is the few and the exceptional and extraordinary (in the literal sense of the term) that chalk the line for judgment.

And of those who think and record their systematic thoughts, the philosophers of the world: how many, and yet, how few! And it is the few, the exceptional, the extraordinary, that count.

And of those who live life itself: how many—millions and millions in every department of life; yet how few that stand out! And it is those who stand out, the exceptional, the extraordinary, who really count, who help on the world by their example, who live life truly. How many kings, admirals, generals, churchmen, statesmen, orators, preachers, administrators, has the world seen in successive generations! Yet how few does the world need to remember!

Take the innermost sanctuary of life, the sanctuary of the soul that prays. Millions of people pray, and millions have prayed, in all religious tongues, and in all the generations. Yet the masters of prayer are few indeed—Buddha, Plotinus, John the Divine, Paul the Apostle, Anthony of the Desert, Basil, Benedict, Theresa of Spain, John of the Cross, Francis the Poor Man of Assisi, Jakob Boehme, Tauler, and some others. Add another hundred, if you will; you have still got a marvellously scanty list in comparison with the numbers who pray and have prayed. Again, it is the exceptional and the extraordinary who are the really normal, who set the standard, who count.

The contention of this article will probably be widely conceded. Yet the trouble comes in when men set themselves to analyze the extraordinary, and is raised to a higher power of difficulty in the case of the Unique. The human passion for pigeon-holing and labelling is—all honour to us!—a very strong one. Sometimes it proves itself stronger than right judgment, takes the bit between its teeth, and runs away with the coach. The proper process becomes reversed, and instead of the Extraordinary being kept well in sight as the recognized norm, the ordinary, which, like the poor, is "always with us," usurps its place illegitimately. In the first instances we took this matters little, or may even be the more convenient course. The Cullinan diamond can be explained. Science can account for the combination of forces which conspired to give it its unusual size. There is no mystery about it: it goes quite comfortably into the "diamond" pigeon-hole. The same is the case with the Victoria Falls. They can be accounted for; there is no mystery about them, save to the unscientific native,

or to the poet, who manages somehow to go through life without much concern at his ignorance of science, and yet to arrive at truth in his own way. These latter may still find mystery and wonder in the seething depths of the Boiling Pot or the marvel of the Rainbow Fall. In the last resort, whether we regard the Cullinan diamond as the norm for diamonds, or the "ordinary" diamond as the norm, does not matter a jot. The world will roll along quite comfortably whichever view we take. Whether the Victoria Falls are the real waterfall of which all other waterfalls are but a pale copy, or whether the Victoria Falls are a sort of Cinderella among waterfalls, again is not a serious question. In the case of the Pigmies, their uniqueness may suggest a special category. Are such unusual men quite worthy of being pigeon-holed as "men" at all? What of their minds, and their souls, and so on? They are higher in the scale: *some* mystery attaches to them: they are not categorized so easily. They are a more serious question, yet still not very serious. But the higher in the scale we go, the more serious becomes the business of labelling, and the more important, for the explanation of Life, is the arrival at the exact truth. Jones-Smith, Mus.Doc., certainly writes music; Robinson-Brown, R.A., certainly paints pictures. Is Jones-Smith's music comparable to that of Bach; are Robinson-Brown's pictures in the same street with those of Raffaelle? Are there, then, two categories, or is one the real and the other the unreal? And what constitutes the difference? *There* is a problem for you! How analyze the genius of Bach or of Raffaelle? How account exactly for the combination of forces which sent those marvellous threads of melody into Bach's brain, and brought them out again in a web light and transparent as that of the spider, weak-strong, intricate-simple? Raffaelle was a painstaker; he strove to be completely equipped; he studied anatomy as none of his forbears had done; he knew how to place his lines; he was aware of the value of colours and their true juxtaposition. Yet, was that *all?* Does anyone really pretend to know exactly how the thing was done in the case of his art? Who, indeed, is "sufficient for these things"? Perhaps Michael Angelo could have told us much, out of his own experience. Or take the case of Shakespeare, surely an Unique. He was admittedly a vagabond of a fellow in early life, with "little Latin and less Greek." How, then, *could* he have written his plays? Where did he get his education from? How could he possibly have been so conversant with the life of the great, of kings, and courts, and nobles, and high-placed Churchmen, that he so easily portrays? Is it scientific to explain him in terms of the Ordinary at all costs, to declare *tout court* that a genius of that

surpassing and bewildering order simply could not ever have existed ? The plaguy pigeon-hole gapes empty. It is tempting to shove Bacon into it and tell him to puff himself out like the frog till he appears to fill it. But is that sort of thing real business in the painful discovery of truth ? It is surely truer and more honest to say: " Here is a baffling genius; he refuses to be explained; certainly we have not the powers to explain him; if ever his like comes along again, then we may be able to get an explanation from him."

Or take St. Theresa of Spain. Her first Director thought her mad, or at least in danger of eccentricity. He could not understand the extraordinary workings of her soul. He therefore—poor well-meaning fool !—sought to reduce the abnormality to a normality, and nearly killed the poor Saint in the process. He also tried to cram genius into the pint-pot he knew. Just suppose he had succeeded, and that Theresa had been less brave and less faithful to the truth she knew as most *cannot* know it ! Imagine the loss to the world if the " Interior Castle " had never been penned !

Or take the supreme life of all lives, the life of The Man, of our Lord Christ. Of all the lives that ever have been lived, this one has most arrested attention, most baffled enquiry. " How knoweth this man letters, never having learned ?" So " those who knew," the Scribes and the Pharisees, the erudite and the religious, expressed their puzzlement. The Crucifixion is the measure of their understanding, an eternal warning against trust in preconceptions. " How *can* this man give us His flesh to eat ?" " How *can* this one Man's death abolish death and atone for all sin ?" " How *can* this Man violate the known Uniformity of Nature and be born out of the ordinary course, and rise again as others had not ?" The questions are still asked; the Scribes and Pharisees are not dead.

Gentlemen of the Scribes and Pharisees, you believe in one Unique, in the Lord God. You rightly warn us at times against " anthropomorphic " conceptions of Him; that is to say, recognizing Him as unique, you bid us respect the uniqueness of His nature, and expect that that nature will act uniquely. You allow that God projects Himself into the world He has made. Why not allow that He may sometimes project Himself uniquely if the reason for doing so be unique ? Why labour to reduce the Unique Life to terms of the Ordinary ? What parallel can there be? or what human experience is there which can fully explain that unique life ? Sinful human nature has no other experience of a Sinless One, and what sinless humanity is capable of. One alone shared that sinlessness, His Blessed Mother. Her testimony is, therefore, unique in its value, and

she has given it. Your problems are no problems for her. And is it not scientific to turn for witness to those whose experience has come nearest? There is Augustine of Hippo, no meanly equipped man, an Extraordinary who produced an unique book, the "Confessions." With him let us couple another Extraordinary, Thomas of Aquinum, whose "Summa" is also an unique among other "Summas." Their testimony is the same as that of Mary, or that of John the Divine, also author of an unique, the "Apocalypse." All these had pre-eminently lived *the* Life. It would be a commonplace to add Paul the Apostle, or the great Christian Mystics. Still the same testimony. Gentlemen, these people are *capable* of judging better than most of us. And if the genius of a Pheidias, a Beethoven, a Shakespeare, a St. Theresa are problems too great for our capacity for full explanation, and we are content to leave them haloed with mystery, *a fortiori* will this necessarily be the case with the life of Christ. The Unique is necessarily inexplicable, except in the simplest instances.

It is said that "philosophy begins in wonder." The true philosopher may well leave off in wonder too, and his world be thereby the larger, the more spacious, the truer. He "knows in part," and knows that he knows only in part, and so he "prophesies in part." It was an Extraordinary, if he were not in truth an Unique, who first made that very profound remark.

R. Ll. Langford-James.

MR. WELLS'S EXPANDING BIBLE*

There is a well-known annual fixture that goes by the name of Gentlemen *v.* Players. The Players generally win, but after all, where would the game be without the Gentlemen? It has been suggested that, since each of these names seems to imply an insult to the other side, it would be well to rename the encounter Amateurs *v.* Professionals. In many other departments of life besides cricket the healthy rivalry of amateurs and professionals is ever in progress, and it is the good fortune of theology, considered simply as a branch of science, that the amateur can enter the lists with the professional without being hopelessly handicapped by his amateurism. In geology, for example, this is not so, and the priesthood of the exact sciences do not get the benefit of this wholesome stimulus from without. For wholesome it is. Blake declared that Voltaire would be forgiven for blaspheming against God, but that those would not be forgiven (and he was thinking of the professional theo-

* *The Salvaging of Civilization*, by H. G. Wells (Cassells, 6*s.*).

logians) who had blasphemed against the Holy Spirit in Voltaire. Mr. Wells is an amateur theologian of great gifts and great influence, and there is much to be gained and nothing lost by treating him not only as courteously as but even more courteously than he seems to deserve. "Use every man after his desert and who shall 'scape whipping?"

The war, which was, we were told, to have kindled a new religious energy in the Churches, did at any rate kindle Mr. Wells. What was it that his hero Mr. Britling "saw through"? Not the war, but the fog of agnosticism in his own mind. He saw through to God. This God he expounded to us without a novelist's disguises in *God the Invisible King*, a kind of neo-Arianism, farther from orthodoxy than sympathetic professionals had hoped. Then came another novel, *The Soul of a Bishop*, and the gulf between the two religions was further emphasized. Then from religion Mr. Wells passed back to education and under the new alias of "Oswald" sought in vain an adequate school for Joan and Peter. Then, that the professionals might receive their due, in the striking allegory of *The Undying Fire* the professional was himself the hero, a Prometheus gagged and bound, not by an angry Jove but by the meanness and stupidity of the community he would serve. Every laity, we learn, has the clergy it deserves. Two education novels had to be followed by a direct contribution to appliances of education, and Mr. Wells wrote *The Outline of History*, in which again the religious element is by no means the least striking part. Finally this new book *The Salvaging of Civilization* is a kind of expansion of the epilogue of the *Outline*.

Mr. Wells might have taken as the text of his new book the last words of Nurse Cavell: "Patriotism is not enough." It is an unpopular text, and the persons responsible for the Cavell Memorial in Charing Cross Road have suppressed it in favour of "Pro Patria." Mr. Wells holds that, unless the nations can rise above patriotism and live together as a United States of the World, civilization is doomed. He believes that it is hopeless to expect anything constructive from the present race of politicians and their inadequate League of Nations. Only through the slow, silent pressure of a new public opinion can a new type of statesmanship be evolved. Mr. Wells figures himself less as a vote-catching pamphleteer than as a missionary of a new religion. "The world-State must begin; it can only begin as a propagandist cult or as a group of propagandist cults to which men and women must give themselves and their energies, regardless of the consequences to themselves." This thing can be done, for it has been done before. Christianity and Islam each transformed a large tract of the world in a very few centu-

ries, starting from far less promising beginnings and enjoying none of the modern machinery of rapid transport, cheap print, and wellnigh universal literacy, at any rate among the most important peoples.

Approaching his subject from this angle, Mr. Wells is naturally reminded of the Bible and the Koran, and the amazing part they have played in history. The Bible has been the *cement* of our civilization. Is it not something more than a chance coincidence that at one and the same time the Bible should be losing its grip on us and our civilization should be threatened with dissolution? During the last century life's mechanics have grown with an unprecedented rapidity, while religion has lost touch with a changing world, and scarcely even professes to guide us amidst its complexities. The Bible is ossified, out of date, a closed canon. We need a new Bible that will give us what the Old Testament gave the Jews, or what the Old and New Testaments combined gave the early Christians.

In a very fresh and vigorous chapter Mr. Wells summarizes the uses that the Bible originally served, and was intended to serve, by its authors and compilers. "The first thing the Bible gave a man was a cosmogony. It gave him an account of the world in which he found himself, and of his place in it. And then it went on to a general history of mankind. . . . It linked him to all mankind with a conception of relationships and duties. Out of the individual it made a citizen with a code of duties and expectations. . . .

"The next thing in order that the Bible gave a man, and the community to which he belonged, was the Law. Rules of health. The real Bible, our model, is extremely explicit on a number of points, upon what constitutes cleanness and uncleanness. . . . It was, for its times and circumstances, a directory of healthy practice. . . . And closely connected with the care of one's mental and bodily health is sexual morality, upon which, again, Deuteronomy and Leviticus are most explicit. . . . There are also the problems of Property and Trade and Labour, upon which the old Bible did not hesitate to be explicit."

There follow, as Mr. Wells finds, books of poetry and romance and exhortation, and finally, closing alike the Old Testament and the New, books of prophecy, revelation, *forecast*.

The scheme of the old Bible could hardly be improved upon, and Mr. Wells is prepared to take it over *en bloc*. But every section requires rewriting. Modern astronomy and geology will supply the place of the old Story of Creation, and the Biblical "Outline of History" will have to be recast and brought up to date; and yet, as Mr. Wells finely says, "though on the surface

it may seem to be a very different history from the Bible story, in substance it will really be very much the same history, only robbed of ancient trappings and symbols, and made real and fresh again for our present ideas. It will still be a story of conditional promises, of the promises of human possibility, a record of sins and blunders, and lost opportunities, of men who walked not in the way of righteousness, of stiff-necked generations, and of merciful renewals of hope. It will still point our lives to a common future which will be the reward and judgment of our present lives."

The Law, again, requires rewriting if it is to serve its original purpose. Mr. Wells might have considered here that it has already been "rewritten" by Christ. But had he considered this point (as in the text of his book he does not) I imagine he would have added that the world of Christ was in its details as remote from our own as the world of Leviticus. Take the case of the moral problems of property: "The vast credit system of our days, joint stock company enterprise and the like, were beyond the imagination of that time. So, too, was any anticipation of modern industrialism. And accordingly we live to-day in a world in which neither property nor employment has ever been properly moralized. The bulk of our present social and economic troubles is due very largely to that." And such sayings as "Blessed are the poor" and "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle" are less helpful than we are inclined to pretend they are.

And there is the whole sphere of international and imperial morals. Sometimes one is inclined to wish that Christ had preached not in Judæa, a conquered province with no "politics" beyond a hopeless nationalist movement, but in Rome, the London of antiquity.

But to return to and complete Mr. Wells's Bible. After the Law will follow an anthology, or a series of anthologies, drawn from the most inspiring literature of the world; there will be Hebrew psalms, and modern poems; the four Gospels, and Lincoln's Gettysburg oration. And lastly, there must be the book of Forecasts. "We have statesmen and politicians who profess to guide our destinies. Whither are they guiding our destinies? Surely they have some idea. The great American statesmen and the great European statesmen are making To-morrow. What is the To-morrow they are making? They must have some idea of it. . . . They ought to write down their ideas of this future before us. It would be helpful to all of us. It might be a very helpful exercise for them." And again, "I put it to you that the psychology, the mentality of a community that has a *Book of Forecasts* in hand, and under

watchful revision, will be altogether steadier and stronger and clearer than that of a community which lives as we do to-day."

Finally, this new Bible, once launched, will be subject to periodic revisal by a committee of experts similar in character to the committee Mr. Wells desires for its original compilation. The most remarkable and deplorable feature of the old Bible is that it left off. It is as though we still employed the first edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. The new Bible will be always approximately up to date, fitting the ever-growing body of humanity as a new suit of clothes. As such it will be the universal textbook of education, and to the subject of educational ideals and methods Mr. Wells devotes his remaining chapters.

We have taken the liberty of quoting fairly fully, because only so can the spirit of this curious and inspiring book be conveyed. It is at once ridiculous and sublime; the work of the incorrigible, the inspired, amateur. State it baldly: "Mr. Wells proposes the construction of a new Bible," and the thing sounds merely silly; to the Greeks, the academic folk, foolishness; to the Jews, the orthodox, a stumbling-block. But is it altogether silly? Mr. Wells's Bible, you say, will never be compiled. True enough, but is that altogether a matter for congratulation? Granted also that there is more life in the old Bible than Mr. Wells seems to suppose, is it not true that that life is potential rather than actual? Is it not true that we fail to handle our Bible in such a way as to overcome the real difficulties inherent in its chronological remoteness? In fine, granted that we have got to muddle along with the old Bible, and that Mr. Wells's new Bible is either a vision or a joke, has the old Bible a message to the world to-day, and how can we elucidate that message?

To offer answers to these questions in such an article as the present would be merely impertinent. But it may be worth while indicating two directions in which difficulties lie with which the Church will have to grapple very much more resolutely than it seems prepared to do at present if it aspires to guide and influence statesmanship and mundane common-sense towards what we used to call "reconstruction." During the war it was all very well to figure reconstruction as a neat little bundle of treaties and Acts of Parliament, enough to fill the post-war electoral programme. We have had our post-war election with its prospective hanging of the Kaiser and homes for heroes, and reconstruction has receded and expanded until it seems to merge in the establishment of the Kingdom of God itself. Here seems to be a call to the churches.

The first problem which has to be faced, as it appears to

the present writer, is, Does the teaching of Christ lay down principles which cover our modern problems, and, if so, what is their application? On such a point, as it seems, there ought to be a general measure of agreement, and when there is disagreement the leaders should make it plain that this, and not that, is the teaching of Christ, and that those who think and preach otherwise are quite strictly and definitely heretical. After all, it is much more important that the Church should know its own mind and preach boldly and unanimously what it believes Christ meant when He said "Blessed are the poor" and "Love your enemies," than that it should secure uniformity on such points as those involved in the Victorian ritualist controversies. Christ gave us not laws but principles: but principles must be continually reapplied to changing complexities of circumstance.

Lastly, how are we to reconcile the world to the fact that our Bible "leaves off"? This is clearly the fact that impresses Mr. Wells more unfavourably than any other. Fifty years ago we used to teach that the Bible was the handwriting of God. Did God lay down the pen in weariness, or because the education of humanity was completed? Now we teach that the Bible is a human record of God's work for man. But the question becomes not less, but more insistent: Why is the record broken off? Is it because God's work is now carried on, if at all, on a different system? The difficulty can be illustrated from our work in schools. For school purposes "Divinity" and "Scripture" have come to be interchangeable terms. Now the latest book of the New Testament was written about the end of the first century A.D., and the limitation of "Divinity" to the study of these books carries with it the inevitable suggestion that God's work among men either ceased abruptly about 100 A.D. or entered at that date upon a new and infinitely less important phase. In the Bible the works of God are plain for all to see; the simpler the intelligence, the plainer they seem. But now "God moves in a mysterious way," and for the plain man that is usually equivalent to saying that He does not "move" at all. In face of this fact, no amount of assertion to the contrary will convince the ordinary boy that in the Bible we have a picture of how God works in the world to-day. To him the whole thing is irrelevant, and a religion based on the Bible alone is a religion out of touch with the modern world.

In fine, Mr. Wells raises an old problem and offers a new solution. We cannot accept his solution. But it would be idle to pretend that the problem does not concern us; still more idle to pretend that the churches are succeeding any better than Mr. Wells in the solving of it.

D. C. SOMERVELL.

ARCHIBALD EAN CAMPBELL

Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway

The day after the sudden death, on April 18, 1921, from heart failure of the Bishop there appeared in the *Glasgow Herald* a notice of him, in which the following passage occurs:

"By his own flock Bishop Campbell will be remembered for the unflagging spirit with which he laboured to discharge the responsibilities of his high office. The success of his rule in the diocese is not to be measured by statistics showing the progress of the Episcopal Church in Glasgow and in the West and South of Scotland, impressive though the figures might be. The influence of his personality, warmed by a lovable geniality that made friends for him among all classes, extended far beyond the clergy and the laity of his own diocese. To Bishop Campbell religion was a joyful experience, and he had, in a wonderful degree, the faculty of making those who came in contact with him share his fine, healthy optimism. To his own Church Bishop Campbell's death brings a sense of irreparable loss; and the whole fellowship of Christians is deprived of a powerful influence for good. Always ready to help every effort to advance the common weal, the Bishop occupied an honoured place in the public life of Glasgow. His broad sympathies, his kindliness of heart, his cheerful outlook on life, and his cultured tastes, were reflected in his daily work, as well as in social circles that he brightened by his delightful companionship and his unfailing sense of humour."

It is proposed in this article to give an appreciation principally of the Bishop's character justifying the high praise quoted.

The bare facts of his life can be stated with great brevity. He was a cadet of the House of Argyll, the son of Colonel Walter Campbell of Skipness (author of *The Forest Ranger*) and descended directly from a son of the second Earl of Argyll. Born June 1, 1856, his boyhood was spent in the neighbourhood of Glasgow. He was educated at King William's College, Isle of Man; Clare College, Cambridge, where he was a foundation scholar and graduated in 1880 (Senior Optime, Mathematical Tripos); and Cuddesdon. He was ordained priest in 1881, and was curate at Aberdare, South Wales, 1881-1885. In that year he married the Honourable Helen A. Brodrick, and became Rector of Castle Rising, Norfolk, where he remained until 1891. Then he went to Leeds, where he was vicar of All Souls' until 1901. In the latter year Bishop Wilkinson called him to Perth to become Provost of St. Ninian's Cathedral there. In 1904 he was consecrated Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway, and in

Glasgow he remained until his death. He was made a D.D. in 1904, and D.C.L. in 1910.

The Episcopal Church in Scotland since 1689 has been, of course, a voluntary Church, and still its adherents are a relatively small proportion of the population. It is estimated that in the Bishop's Diocese there may be some, say, 80,000 members of the Church, but these are to be found in all parts of a huge diocese which has nearly half the whole population of Scotland, and the work of the Bishop was necessarily varied and arduous.

Glasgow for long was indifferent and almost hostile to the Episcopal Church. The members of it had to keep themselves on their religious side practically separate, but it can be said with confidence that all that has passed away. In part, this is due to the growth of the spirit of tolerance and goodwill which is a characteristic of the time. In part, to the influence of broad-minded clergy, perhaps especially to the example of Christian life set by the late Bishop Harrison (Bishop Campbell's predecessor), who passed away at a ripe old age only some months ago. Yet, it may be said with a real measure of truth that the fact that in Glasgow sectarianism, especially as regards the Episcopal Church, is wellnigh a thing of the past, is largely due to the episcopate of Archibald Ean Campbell.

That the words in the *Herald* were in no sense an exaggerated reflection of the feeling of the city was shown on the day of the funeral at St. Mary's Cathedral, when, in the forenoon at the Requiem Eucharist, a mourning congregation of relatives and of his own people assembled, and in the afternoon the church was crowded with all classes, including the Lord Provost and representatives of the Town Council, of the University, of the great Presbyterian churches and other denominations, as well as bishops and clergy of his own communion.

What was the secret of powers which justified such words as those of the *Herald*, or the sense of loss on the part of the diocese and the Scottish Church of one who, in his seventeen years' work, proved what a spiritual leader and a Church statesman and organizer can do ?

Undoubtedly the fact that he was a Scottish gentleman, a native, so to speak, of his diocese, was in his favour. The cause, however, was far more that, as regards the community generally, those who met him came to think of him not only as priest or bishop, but also as a Christian man of the world, one who enjoyed all innocent pleasures and recreations of this life. He was equally at home in society, where he was an excellent conversationalist (The writer remembers one dinner—the Bishop with another Bishop, perhaps wittier even than himself, being the guests, with three others present—which is one of the few red-letter dinners of his life); or in the smoking-room, among

young men with whom he was at once at ease, and they with him, without the slightest loss of respect; or as a golfer; one, indeed, who loved a legitimate holiday, and even a truant day if it could legitimately be captured; a man not only witty himself, but with a lively sense of humour. Is it too trivial to mention how an acquaintance tells that his last sight of the Bishop was seeing him at a distance in Princes Street, Edinburgh, in front of a Punch and Judy show, enjoying it with the zest of a small boy ?

The whole point of these illustrations of character is lost if emphasis is not laid on the word " Christian " in the definition. Somehow, those he associated with never could forget that feature, although in ordinary intercourse it was seldom in actual evidence. This life was the life to be lived to-day, and therefore to be made the most of in its pleasures as in its work, but the Christian saw this life in its proportion as part of the life to come, and a prelude to it.

Let it be added that, in his priestly and episcopal work, no one could carry himself with more dignity or more convince all of the depth of his religious fervour and the strength of his faith. A High Churchman, he had not a trace of intolerance. His rule as Bishop was impartial, judicial, broad-minded. Knowledge of the world was brought to his aid so as to give him the tact and outlook which enabled him to solve and compose difficulties and worries daily before him. He was too manly to favour weak compromise, and too able not to take counsel with others whenever such was called for.

If he had a fault as Bishop it was that he spent himself too much on work, and the doing of work not properly his own, to help others, or make things more easy, without sufficiently considering his duty to take care of himself. Literally he died, at all events as death came, from want of care of himself.

In council with his fellow-Bishops and in the various Committees and Councils of the Church he was statesmanlike, and not seldom his opinion widened the outlook and guided the decision. But this article does not aim at reviewing his daily work. Its character and power can be inferred from the estimate, so far as just, of his character and intellectual force.

Rather let us revert to the personal side. The qualities which, more perhaps than others, endeared the Bishop to his fellow-men, were his intense loyalty and the warmth of his affections; loyalty to the Clan Campbell; to his country; to the places and people where he lived, with affection added; love for friends and relatives—above all, too sacred more than to refer to, for wife and home. He never forgot the miners he ministered to some forty years ago, and revisited Aberdare when he could. Leeds ever kept its place in his interest and affection.

Yet, let us remember that this man, with so strong a necessity

laid on him to love those he was in contact with and knew, and who practically all his priestly life was a Home Mission priest except for the few years at Castle Rising, gave, through no doubt in part at first the strength of his faith and of his obedience to his Master's commands, his chief love to the cause of Foreign Missions. One of the leading results of his episcopate was revived zeal for Foreign Mission work in the diocese and the Scottish Church. He more than once visited South Africa in the cause, the last time not two years ago. He only declined, as the writer thinks, a South African bishopric because his humility of mind led him to feel he could not justifiably refuse the advice tendered to him from those he consulted that it was his duty not to forsake the work at home.

Bishop Campbell was an earnest seeker after Christian Unity, and was deeply thankful for the outflow of the Spirit which he, in common it is thought with all those who attended the Lambeth Conference, felt had guided the Anglican Episcopate in their deliberations and in their written words. He was a member, almost from the time he came to Scotland, of the Christian Unity Association in Scotland—an association which, small in numbers, but owing its inception to the late Bishop Wilkinson, and composed of ministers of various denominations with some representative lay people, has played no small part in fostering by prayer, discussion, and fellowship, the spirit of Christian Unity in Scotland. The writer believes that the Bishop, in common with many who have thought on the subject, did not wish the Lambeth proposals too soon to become the subject of analytical discussion with any immediate view to outward formal unity. In Scotland, at least, premature discussion of the proposals as if they were in any sense ripe for adoption might do harm of the most serious character. Rather the Bishop hoped that the spirit of Christian penitence, goodwill, recognition of freedom of conscience, the desire to do common work against sin, scepticism, and indifference with all those who recognize the authority of Christ, which pervades the Lambeth appeal, might permeate more and more all Christian Churches. If so, then those who see the vision of one Catholic Church may well be content to wait the further leading of the Spirit to accomplish that end. Looking back on what has been overcome of bitterness and controversy during the last fifty years, culminating as it has now done in the Lambeth appeal, we may well thank God and take courage. Of those who have contributed to the spread of this Christian spirit within his own sphere of influence, none has been more potent for good than the Bishop. In the city of Glasgow and in the diocese over which he ruled he will long be remembered with warm affection and high respect.

JOHN A. SPENS.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Mr. Thouless's article in this number is the first of a series of four which will appear in Theology during the next few months. Those who have read Mr. Spens's *Belief and Practice*, now in its second edition, will be reminded of the theory of knowledge there put forward and applied to the facts presented by the Christian religion. We cannot say whether the Cambridge Platonists of an earlier age are to be succeeded by a school of Cambridge Apologists in this; but we would bespeak for this new method of approach a very thorough consideration.

It was inevitable that the Lambeth Appeal for Unity should sooner or later bring the subject of Confirmation into the foreground; and we understand that the Montreal proposals, published in Theology in July, have already led to this question being raised in Canada. This is all to the good; for, so far from being merely a part of the interior economy of our own Communion, there is no rite of the Church which has a more fruitful history as the pledge and instrument of reconciliation. No doubt this aspect of it will be fully dealt with in the comprehensive study of the subject which is now said to be in course of preparation at the hands of a number of recognized scholars. Meanwhile, considerable evidence is provided in the volume of essays entitled *The Early History of the Church and Ministry*, of which a second edition is now available; and Mr. Lowther Clarke's article, which appeared in two parts in our May and June numbers, will have helped many to appreciate the immense weight of biblical authority there is for the universality of the rite.

Oremus.

A Prayer of Erasmus.

(*Freely translated.*)

O Lord Jesus Christ, suffer us not, we beseech Thee, to stray from Thee Who art the Way, nor to doubt Thee Who art the Truth, nor to rest in aught but Thee Who art the Life; but by Thy Holy Spirit make clear our path, and strong our faith, and sure our everlasting home, Who with the Father and the same Spirit livest. . . .

PAPERS FOR THE PRIESTHOOD

A.—DEVOTION

By Rev. W. B. Trevelyan, formerly Warden of Liddon House

III.—INTERCESSION

The consideration of such subjects as Vocal Prayer, and the saying of the Daily Offices, may to some seem needless. But it is far from being so. Indeed, those who are led, or imagine themselves to be led, to the higher paths of prayer, are peculiarly liable to the temptation of feeling a certain contempt for what seems more ordinary and matter-of-fact.

This is a point that has lately been much emphasized; and it is well. For although, for some persons, advance lies in the direction of deeper and more spiritual devotion, and although some are led to more elastic and less methodical forms of prayer, forms which, if they lead those who use them to do and suffer what God calls them to, must be all to the good—yet we need to be reminded that to attempt such practices as the "prayer of quiet," and to forget the historical and concrete side of our religion, with its more definite and formal setting, may be disastrous. Such simple forms of devotion as were considered last month can be ignored by none who really desire to grow in true devotion.

One particular department of this more concrete kind of prayer shall now be considered—viz., Intercession. It is impossible for any priest who wishes his work to be effective to ignore it, for there are few practices of the spiritual life which tend more surely to refresh and vivify that work. We might gather this from the fact that so many discouragements and difficulties beset us when we try to make better or fuller use of it. But it is in view of the life of our Incarnate Lord, and the practice of the saints, that we learn to look upon it as a definite duty binding on every priest. The long hours spent by our Lord upon the mountain, the days spent in the deserts (St. Luke v. 16), His prayers upon the Cross, showing us what His constant practice must have been, all make this abundantly clear. It is impossible to read the Gospels—whether the Synoptists or St. John—without seeing that His whole earthly life was lived in an atmosphere of prayer, and coloured by it. Now that, in His glorified life, "He ever liveth to make intercession for us," it should be impossible for us to dare to live or work without linking our intercession to His.

Intercession should be the very breath of a priest's life. When we are most conscious of our shortcomings in the matter; or when, as sometimes happens, we are filled with a real desire to pray, yet in the very moment of expressing it are seized by some strange inability to pray at all, we may take comfort from the fact that we have at least discovered our need of this practice, and dare not attempt to help anyone in spiritual things until we have taken them to God first. M. le Maistre said once of the Port-Royalists that it was their aim to carry out the maxim of St. Augustine, and rather to speak to God on behalf of men than to men on behalf of God.* As regards the difficult times when we seem quite unable to pray with reality, we might do well to remember the advice given by Bishop Creighton, "It is a very extraordinary thing how hard it is to say one's prayers rightly. Everybody always feel it. It is a sign how bad we naturally are. Do you remember that the disciples came to

* E. K. Sanders, *Angélique of Port Royal*, p. 179.

Jesus and asked Him, 'Lord, teach us to pray'? It is a thing we cannot do by ourselves. I always think the collect so wise which claims for us no more than to be 'those to whom Thou hast given an hearty desire to pray.' It does not say that we can pray, but that God has given us a wish to pray. It is a thing which does not come naturally, but has to be practised and improved. I believe that everybody supposes that everybody else prays more easily than they do, but it is difficult for us all."*

So a priest must make up his mind that, however great the difficulties may be, he must, if he is to bear rightly the responsibility of his work, make prayer for others a large and definite part of his daily life.

But here comes in another difficulty. There gradually, to a busy man, mounts up a long list of people who must be prayed for—penitents, communicants, those preparing for the sacraments, the sinful, the tempted, the fallen, the sick and suffering, and the many others who, not perhaps always wisely or considerately, ask his prayers. Further, there is the ever-growing list of the departed, whom he must not forget, a list that has grown so long lately. Nor must he overlook the claims of blood or friendship. As interests widen, all kinds of subjects claim a place, not only those which concern the parish or diocese, but others which have to do with the wider work of the Church at home and overseas. Moreover, there are always the urgent calls of the country, and indeed, of the whole world, especially in such difficult times as the present. In fact, if health permitted, and there were no external claims, we might well give all our time profitably to such prayer.

But this cannot and ought not to be, and so it sometimes comes about that our attempts to cope with the duty may, from sheer pressure, either become formal and unreal, or else careless and forgetful, unlike the prayers of Him Who, "having loved His own which were in the world, loved them unto the end." Obviously, then, we must learn to steer between rigidity and laxity. It cannot be that we are to throw aside all this definite prayer, and be content with vague and general petitions, though there is room for these, even as we move about our parishes. But we must not forget how our Lord prayed for individuals: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath asked to have you." It may well be that the fact of His praying specially for St. Peter may guide us here, and that we too must single out for special and frequent prayer those who by strength of character or for some other reason are more likely to promote God's cause and win others to Him. But if ever we are tempted to grow lax we may try to realize how many people are perhaps upheld by those seemingly feeble prayers which have cost us so much, and to remember what we ourselves might have been but for the prayers of our friends.

Probably for most of us the aim must be for more system, more frequent revision, more careful arrangement of our time, above all, for more of what Fr. Faber calls "impetus." For some, again, we shall have to continue to pray: to others we may give a shorter time. Frequently we must be content to sum up many individual needs in one "Our Father" said with intention. But in a very busy life all this is difficult, even the finding a chance to make the plans.

It might be well occasionally to re-read such a book as Forbes Robinson's *Letters*: only remembering as we do so that we do not all possess his very exceptional gift of prayer, but must be content to pray as God hath given us "the measure of faith."

* *Life*, vol. ii., p. 414.

Did space permit, quotations bearing closely on this matter of revision of method should be given from Walter Hilton's *Scale of Perfection* (*e.g.*, pp. 178, 179, 191, 192. Art and Book Co., 1901); but a reminder that he has much to say about it must be enough. Reference may also be made to Law's *Serious Call*, chapters xiv. and xxi.

Meanwhile we must take comfort from the fact that, feeble as we may be, it is better and more effective to be with Abraham on the mountain praying for Sodom, than with Lot in the city "vexing his righteous soul." And scarcely any practice can help us more in keeping our own lives on something like a high level, for all depends on what we *are*. "If I incline unto wickedness with mine heart, the Lord will not hear me."

B.—IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

III.—LINGUISTIC EQUIPMENT

A properly equipped theologian has a thorough working knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. Some acquaintance with Greek and Latin may be presupposed in readers of Theology, though the mental effort involved in tackling a book in these tongues may be proving increasingly irksome. Every theological scholar should win and retain sufficient knowledge of Greek and Latin to enable him to appreciate an argument based on shades of meaning which are apparent only in the original. Without this he is at the mercy of the latest plausible theory, and has to take on trust much which he should prove. Greek, of course, comes first. English, unlike German, has shown itself incapable of developing a technical and scientific vocabulary from its native word-stock, and has had recourse to Greek. An education without Greek is incomplete, for an Englishman thus bereft is in the humiliating position of failing to comprehend a large part of his own language. But a priest without Greek is to be pitied; the New Testament, the Book of books, which contains the actual words of the apostles and apostolic men, perhaps those of our Lord Himself, must remain unread.

An unrepealed canon requires the clergy to be learned in the Latin tongue. When it was enacted, the medieval predominance of Latin had hardly been shaken, and since then a great theological literature has been built up in English. But Latin remains the theological tongue *par excellence:* the peculiar genius of the language makes it the best medium for expressing the ideas of theology. The loose writing of the average Englishman is impossible in Latin if the rules of Latin prose are observed. That Latin should go the way of Greek, and be given up in schools, is most unlikely. If not studied for its own sake it will be kept as the necessary background of the speech and history of Western Europe. It will be humiliating if the boys and girls turned out from the municipal secondary schools of the future find their parish priest has less knowledge of Latin than they. Their respect for the Roman priest will be correspondingly enhanced.

To suggest learning Hebrew to a man who had not begun it at college would seem a counsel of perfection. But a little Hebrew is easily learned, and the pleasure derived therefrom is very great. Few would find it worth while to push their studies so far as to read Isaiah in the original, but once the alphabet is thoroughly mastered the easy parts of Genesis

present little difficulty. We cannot too often remind ourselves that the Old Testament is the rock whence we were hewn, and anything which reveals to us the thought processes of its writers is helpful. For instance, it is a wonderful advance in knowledge when we first realize the Hebrew system of tenses, how that in place of the rich variety of other languages there are two only, denoting incomplete and completed action respectively. Each can be translated by the past, present, or future, according to context. The importance of this in certain passages of the prophets is obvious.

It is a good plan to keep up one's classics with the help of the daily office. The priest will, of course, meditate on the Scriptures at other times. The appeal of the lections is largely intellectual, and there is nothing inappropriate when a Greek or Latin Testament is kept in one's stall in church, and read from if there is no congregation, or if a brother priest's reading of the English is followed in it. For this purpose Souter's Greek Testament (Oxford Press, 4s. 6d.) is best, or Wordsworth and White's *editio minor* of the Vulgate (Bible Society, 2s. 6d.).

The Old Testament too can profitably be studied in connection with the lectionary. Thus on six days in April, allowing for a Sunday breaking the sequence, the Prayer-Book Calendar prescribes portions from Judges. During this week it is helpful to read the whole book in the Revised Version, including the omitted parts, and at least to elucidate the meaning of any passages which puzzle us in the daily portion. Apart from such a plan, the Old Testament will be known to us in parts only.

C.—PASTORAL WORK

By Rev. J. J. G. Stockley

III.—DEALING WITH INDIVIDUALS

In all ages men and women have, at various times and crises in their lives, desired and sought for advice and guidance from others. For it is only the very unwise who think themselves wise enough to be completely independent of outside help. And, notwithstanding the conventional reserve of English people, there are, I hold, thousands of persons, both within and without the circle of Church membership, who crave for assistance in their spiritual and moral perplexities, and would welcome sincere and enlightened direction.

There are also in England some thousands of men, the clergy, whose duty it is to satisfy these needs. At our Ordination to the priesthood the Bishop addressed these words to us:

"Wherefore consider with yourselves the end of your Ministry towards the children of God, towards the Spouse and Body of Christ; and see that you never cease your labour, your care and diligence, until you have done all that lieth in you, according to your bounden duty, to bring all such as are or shall be committed to your charge unto that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there be no place left among you, either for error in religion, or for viciousness in life."

This solemn charge was given to us very deliberately, and we accepted it, in meekness and fear, at the solemn moment we were ordained.

We want to carry it out. How can we do so? Well, first of all through our public ministrations in the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Holy Sacraments. But not only thus. It is not

possible to " bring all such as are committed to our charge unto that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God, and that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ " without constant and Christ-like dealing with individual souls. Our method for all spiritual work must have as its motto the words of Isaiah: " Ye shall be gathered one by one, O ye children of Israel " (Isa. xxvii. 12).

Those who know something of what prevails in methods of Church work nowadays have good reason to be anxious if they really value personal work and recognize its importance. For we are in imminent danger of acting as if it were true that the salvation of the people could be accomplished by mere organization. Nothing on a wide scale can be done without some organization, but are we not in deadly peril of spending our time and thought on endless Committees and in a round of Conferences, Boards, Federations, and Parades ? It is fatally easy to be captured and paralyzed by ecclesiastical machinery instead of using that machinery aright; to make the means into the end; and to forget, either partly or wholly, the great purposes for which our organizations exist.

The studies of some parish priests are rapidly assuming the appearance of the office of a State department. " Efficiency " is the watchword, and we are, perhaps, praised for being " a splendid organizer," or " such a good business man," or such " a first-rate chairman," and so on, while both the rightly human and the priestly side of our work for God gradually and steadily recedes into the background. People say of their Rectors or Vicars: " I don't like to go and worry Mr. So-and-So, he is always so busy." But it happens that his " business " should first of all be with those very persons.

It is time to call a halt, and to get back to our real pastorate. Our obligation, our privilege, is to help the perplexed, to strengthen the weak, to enlighten the doubting and ignorant, to heal the spiritually sick, to guide human souls in the pathway of salvation, and to co-operate with the Holy Spirit in His work of sanctifying those souls who in a special sense are " called to be saints."

But can this be really done in the modern Church of England ? Can organizations be cut down so as to give time and opportunity to the clergy for this personal work ?

These questions will obviously be answered somewhat differently in country and town parishes.

(1) In country parishes there are, of course, plenty of difficulties, but they cannot arise from over-organization. The country priest can always find time for dealing with individuals. And in many cases—far more numerous, I venture to think, than people realize—he is a true pastor of souls, ready and willing, in season and out of season, to sympathize, guide, help, and comfort.

He is often discouraged because, although he is willing to give counsel, many of his people are either too shy or too reserved or too prejudiced to avail themselves of his well-intentioned efforts to befriend them. And when he has been a certain length of time in the parish he often feels that he has done all that can be done in the way of evoking response. He has influenced for God a large proportion of the parishioners, but the others remain obdurate, and, as far as he can judge, will continue so. What is he to do ?

My humble advice would be that he should concentrate on the young people in the schools and in Confirmation classes. Or that he should,

seeking in this the special guidance of the Holy Ghost, decide that a Mission is what the parish needs, and pray and work so that the Missioner's call may reach the hardened hearts and callous consciences of those who have hitherto turned away from religion. After such a Mission his work with certain individuals may be as fruitful as before it was barren.

It must, however, be frankly recognized that, as in the towns for other reasons, so in the country because numbers are limited, priests often stay too long in one parish. Again and again it occurs that a new priest will almost immediately influence persons who would never listen to, or even tolerate, "the old Vicar"—possibly a better man. I venture to press this point, as I have no belief in our tiresome system of long-drawn-out incumbencies. If the Wesleyan plan of three years in one place has obvious drawbacks, our lack of imagination and sense displayed in our leaving excellent men to minister in the *same* small parish year after year and decade after decade is utterly indefensible. It is bad for the parish and equally bad for the priest.

(2) And now as to work for individuals in the town parishes. I am not, in this paper, touching on the hearing of Confessions; but how, apart from this, are we to fulfil our duty of ministering "one by one" to the souls committed to our care by the Good Shepherd?

It is, we hold, more important to help one human soul along the way of life than to attend a Committee—or many committees. It is better to know even a few of our people well—to know about their troubles and difficulties—than it is to know all that can be known of Diocesan or Archidiaconal statistics.

There are, then, some points of practical advice which may enable us to exercise our personal pastorate effectively even if we live in very large parishes and have many calls on our time.

(*a*) First of all, we must be easy of approach. I do not say that the priest will make a mistake who inserts a notice in his parish magazine giving the hours when he may be seen at his house or in the vestry. But I am sure he ought to be ready, when possible, to see people at other times as well.

The laity may be unreasonable in these matters, but we have to remember that there is a long tradition of individual self-sufficiency in the minds of English people, and they have to be drawn away from it very carefully and very gradually. God knows, both they and we all want guidance. Can we not therefore sacrifice some of our cherished and self-made rules so that we may *seem* to be willing, if we *are* willing, to be approached easily and in a friendly fashion by everyone who wants to talk to us. If the stiff and conventional Anglican parson still exists, he is useless for individual work. Let us have done with him.

(*b*) Secondly, if we want to influence people, we must have genuine respect for them and real sympathy with them. It is so easy to write these words, and so terribly difficult to conquer ourselves if we are not by nature sympathetic. All that we know is that we have got to re-learn Christ again and again if we are to represent Him faithfully to the souls for whom He died. Whether we are dealing with the intellectually perplexed, or with the morally weakened sinner, or with the man or woman overburdened with cares, our duty is the same—to be patient, sympathetic, wise, helpful. Don't let us seem hurried. It is so easy to frighten people away finally.

I had the great honour and happiness of knowing intimately the late Father Dolling. One of the secrets of his influence lay in the fact of his always being ready to listen with extreme patience to anyone who consulted him. People wanted to come to him because they were sincerely welcomed.

(*c*) Thirdly, we must study human nature. We should read psychology and the best modern novels. We ought to know the world we live in, and study its moral and social problems. If the educated young man or young woman of the present day deigns to consult us, we must at least know what he or she is talking about. The easily-shocked clergyman will be no use to them. But the fearless priest, with convictions and understanding, will at least win their respect and may win their souls.

(*d*) And, lastly, we must be fervently persistent in all our dealings with individuals. We must not let people slip away easily. If we watch and pray for a particular person, and go on watching and praying, then we shall in very many instances succeed. The soul will decide for Christ, and make the great surrender of self to His keeping in the faithful membership of His Holy Church.

Yes, the Church of England can only succeed in winning the people of England back to the Faith when we, the priests of the Church, act on the belief that "one by one"—and in no other way—are the children of the new Israel gathered to God.

D.—CIVIC RELATIONS OF THE MINISTRY

By Miss A. Deane, O.B.E.

II.—CHILDREN THE NATION'S GREATEST ASSET

A great deal is being done in the country to-day with regard to the health and welfare of children both for the period before they go to school and after. We want to know how these things apply to our own locality.

We are concerned, in the first place, with prevention of infant mortality, and are bound in parochial work to consider the help that is possible for mothers. The most progressive Local Authorities have appointed "Health Visitors" to advise and help mothers with regard to the care of newly-born infants. These visitors go to the houses after the notification of birth, which has to be made to the Medical Officer of Health within thirty-six hours, and is now compulsory under the Notification of Births Act. In many places there are still no Health Visitors, but the parish nurse undertakes the work instead.

The work done by the Health Visitor or parish nurse should be linked with an Infant Welfare Centre, where mothers can come and get instruction and assistance, and bring their babies regularly. A doctor is as a rule in charge of the infant consultations, examines them, and advises the mothers. The home visiting in connection with the Centre should only be done by trained visitors, and as a rule the Centre organizes health talks with practical demonstrations.

There are many other things which are done in connection with a really good Infant Welfare Centre, such as the provision of meals and good milk for expectant mothers, and the provision of dental treatment, etc.

State aid can be obtained for Welfare Centres; the Ministry of Health is responsible for the health and welfare of children under five, and half the cost of approved schemes for the care of mothers and babies can be

paid for by the Ministry. The Maternity and Child Welfare Act of 1918 extended the powers of Local Authorities with regard to approved schemes, and made provision for grants in aid.

Day Nurseries, Crèches, and Nursery Schools are now in existence in all parts of the country, and under the Maternity and Child Welfare Act half the total cost of these, if approved, can be paid for by grants.

Children from two to five years old attend Nursery Schools, where such exist. The Education Act of 1918 gave power to the Board of Education to pay grants in aid to the Education Authority or to approved voluntary schemes for Nursery Schools. When we think of the homes in which the majority of our working people live, and we compare the conditions under which the mothers have to bring up their children with those of people who can command a big nursery and a nurse in their private house, we should be thankful that these Municipal and Voluntary Nurseries and Crèches and Nursery Schools exist, and should do our utmost to advocate their extension. Nobody who has watched the effect of their good work on the small people in a parish could fail to do so. At the early age of five the child passes on to the infant school.

The medical inspection of school children insures that attention is paid to the health of the scholars right through their school life, which is still all too short ; children leave the elementary schools at the age of fourteen, and indeed at the age of thirteen, and until the Education Act of 1918 is enforced this will continue.

In many places now the Education Authorities have Care Visitors, who follow up the medical inspection reports, and see that the child gets the treatment advised. Treatment is carried out at the School Clinic in big centres, where there is daily attention paid to minor ailments, and dental treatment, etc., is provided. It is impossible as a rule for country districts to have any centre of this sort, the schools are so scattered. Sometimes arrangements are made for the children to go into a neighbouring town; more often there is a visiting nurse as well as a visiting doctor.

As a result of the development of medical inspection, we have to-day open-air schools for delicate children and special schools for those who are defective or very backward.

In studying the welfare of children, we should remember that a great many of the children coming to the elementary schools are often suffering from insufficient food and are badly nourished. Under the Education Provision of Meals Act, 1906, the Education Authorities were empowered to provide meals within the limit of a halfpenny rate for children who are suffering in this way. This Act was amended in 1914, and removed the limit of the halfpenny rate, and now fifty per cent. of the cost can be paid by grants from the Board of Education.

The difficult time of adolescence needs our serious attention; had the provisions of the new Education Act been enforced, we should have at any rate had continued education for a certain number of hours in the week and in the daytime for every elementary school boy or girl. Nobody has claimed that the system of Evening Continuation Schools has been satisfactory; those who have attended them have often been too tired after a day's work to reap the full benefit of them.

The boys and girls of these schools have to become wage-earners at the earliest possible moment, and at the age of fourteen, if not before, they go out into the industrial world to fight the battle of life for themselves, more often than not very badly equipped and needing desperately the

friendship and wise guidance of those who are competent to advise and help them. The teachers, who have been their best friends at school, do their utmost to keep in touch, and the growth of Old Scholars' Associations in connection with the schools has been a very great help to this end.

Good work is being done to-day by the Juvenile Employment Committees established under the Education (Choice of Employment) Act, 1910, for the purpose of giving advice and help with regard to choice of employment to boys and girls leaving school, and they have in most cases established a system of "after care" by which people interested in juvenile questions keep in touch with individual cases during the difficult years from fourteen to seventeen or eighteen.

These "after care" visitors are often the heads of clubs, Scout Masters, and others who are doing what they can about recreation, and in this they should always be linked, where possible, with the local Juvenile Organizations Committee. Splendid work has been done in some parts of the country by Recreation Councils or Federations of Organizations dealing with recreation, which have obtained grants in aid of the work, in the first instance from the Home Office, and now from the Board of Education under the scheme which was started during the war, and known as the Juvenile Organizations Committee.

Where teachers and parents have the help of a really good Juvenile Employment Committee, they can feel that the years of adolescence are in a measure cared for if employers and workers and those interested in the well-being of the young worker are able to join together in facing the local juvenile problems.

Those who have come closely in touch with lads and girls of fifteen and sixteen to-day who are out of work must feel that the lack of discipline and the long hours of leisure are a menace to the future of the country. What sort of citizens will they make? Have those who have decided to economize in education faced the fact that the unemployed youth with nothing to do is a prey to the spirit that proverbially finds mischief for idle hands? Whereas, if the moment had been seized for continued education, the whole community would have benefited, not only now, but later.

We must surely believe that much of the unrest that has beset the country of late has been due to ignorance, and yet we find people opposing education and deciding that here at least we will begin to economize; it is false economy. There is very much to be done in the matter of creating a right public opinion about education, because legislation cannot go ahead of it. There are some to-day who recognize that the failure to carry out the provisions of the Education Act, 1918, is nothing short of a national disaster, but there are many who are unconvinced. It is the adolescent who is suffering to-day; in many places they have no work, no opportunity of continued education, no Juvenile Choice of Employment Committee, no Recreation Council. The neglect of the adolescent to-day means that your citizen of to-morrow will have deteriorated physically, mentally, and morally. It is a matter which gives food for thought. The child from infancy to the age of fourteen is well provided for if existing machinery is properly used, and then it breaks down. Is it too much to ask for the concentration of voluntary effort upon this problem of the adolescent, not to-morrow, but to-day?

SOME MAIN DIVISIONS OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL

We venture to suggest that it has not yet been seen how clearly the main divisions of St. John's Gospel are ecclesiastical and, indeed, sacramental. This aspect of the Fourth Gospel has received a new significance by the momentous decisions and appeal of the Lambeth Conference of Bishops in Communion with the Sees of Canterbury and York. In the words of the Bishop of Zanzibar: "They lay down the necessity of a common faith, *a common use of the Gospel Sacraments*, and a common ministry, if we are, as groups, to live within one visible organization" (*Church Times*, August 20).

We will set down these main divisions of St. John's Gospel—(A) in outline; and (B) in simple detail.

A.—DIVISIONS IN OUTLINE.

Chapter I.—Holy Order.
„ II.—Matrimony.
„ III.—Baptism (Confirmation ?).
„ IV. (V.).—Penance.
„ VI.—Holy Eucharist.
„ (XII.—Extreme Unction ?)

B.—DIVISIONS IN DETAIL.

Chapter I. 35, etc.—Holy Order.

35 *Again on the morrow John was standing, and two of his disciples*; **36** *and he looked upon Jesus as He walked, and saith, Behold, the Lamb of God!* **37** *And the two disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus.*

The writer of these words is evidently in earnest to show how John, the prophet, sent his disciples to Jesus.

39 *He saith unto them, Come, and ye shall see.* The first disciples are called, and invited. They are not just self-called, self-invited.

42 *He brought him unto Jesus. Jesus looked upon him, and said, Thou art Simon the Son of John; thou shalt be called Cephas (which is by interpretation, Peter).*

The Evangelist has here given a version of the change of St. Peter's name different from that in Matt. xvi. 18.

43-48. Then follows the calling of SS. Philip and Nathanael.

It is not surprising to find (ii. 2): *And Jesus also was bidden, and His disciples, to the marriage.*

St. John makes it quite clear, in the first chapter of his Gospel, that although Jesus is the Son of God, and the Word, and "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," yet He gave certain favours of intimacy, and at length of power, not, indeed, to all the redeemed, but to a group of His own choosing. Moreover, it is significant that, in the narrative of St. John, this choice of the group is the first official act of the Son of God.

Chapter II.—Matrimony.

1 *And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee; and the mother of Jesus was there;* **2** *and Jesus also was bidden.*

This reference to the sacrament of marriage is obvious. It suggests the strange lack of reference to marriage-feasts in the Old Testament. Perhaps the almost legalized polygamy of the Old Testament tended to lower the dignity of the union between man and woman.

Historically the great institution of monogamous marriage may be said to have sprung from this wedding-feast of Cana. The Synoptists contain no reference to our Blessed Lord's presence at this or any other wedding-feast. Their only reference to wedding-feasts is in parables. Hence the value of this Johannine passage to the early Church was very great.

The miracle of transubstantiating water into wine is but a proof of how earnest St. John is to show that marriage is a great sacrament, and how it is a symbol of the Holy Eucharist, in which is wrought the mystic wedlock of the soul and God.

Chapter III.—Baptism (Confirmation ?).

Again, the subject-matter of this dialogue with Nicodemus is so clearly the sacrament of Baptism that no other proof is needed than a patient reading of the context.

A striking parallelism occurs between the difficulties urged by Nicodemus against Baptism and those urged by the Jews against the Holy Eucharist.

Nicodemus.	Jews.
iii. 4. Nicodemus saith unto Him, How can a man be born again when he is old? Can he enter again a second time into his mother's womb and be born?	vi. 43. They said, Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How then doth He now say, I am come down out of heaven?
iii. 9. Nicodemus answered and said unto Him, How can these things be?	vi. 52. The Jews therefore strove one with another, saying, How can this man give us His flesh to eat?

The references to the giving of the Holy Spirit (in Confirmation) are obvious to those who realize that Confirmation was in primitive times given together with Baptism. Even the Sarum Ritual, published at Douay in 1604, supposes that if a Bishop baptizes a child he also administers Confirmation.

iii. 5. *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit,* etc. Already in i. 32 there is a reference to the coming down of the Spirit upon Jesus when He was baptized by St. John the Baptist. *And John bare witness, saying, I have beheld*

the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven; and it abode with Him, etc.

Chapter IV. (V.)—Penance.

The narrator of this scene in Samaria is deeply in earnest to speak of the forgiveness of sins. Almost every detail would be of incalculable authority to the Christians of A.D. 100, to Jewish and non-Jewish alike.

1. The scene is laid in Samaria, in the sinner nation; indeed, in the apostate nation.

2. The offer of forgiveness is made to one who not only shared the national sin of apostasy, but was stained with the personal sin of adultery. Now, the sin of adultery was considered so heinous and unforgivable that the passage viii. 1-11 was not allowed in many copies of the Gospel.

3. These apostate and adulterous Samaritans recognize Jesus fitly as the *Messias* (29), and as *the Saviour of the world* (42). These two titles fully describe His official function towards the forgiveness of sin.

4. There is a suggestive contrast between what the woman demanded when Penance was hinted at, and what the Jews demanded when the Holy Eucharist was hinted at. iv. 15. *Give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come all the way hither to draw.* vi. 34. *They said therefore unto Him, Lord, evermore give us this bread!*

5. The two miracles iv. 46, etc. (the raising of the son of the nobleman of Capernaum), and v. 2 (the raising of the man at the pool of Bethesda) are a confirmation of the doctrine of Penance.

The first miracle (iv. 46, etc.), having been wrought at a distance, is one of the most striking recorded in the Gospels.

The second miracle (v. 2, etc.) offers points of parallelism with the Synoptic miracle of forgiveness. This latter miracle, with its striking characteristics, is recorded with significant detail by St. Matthew (ix. 2, etc.), St. Mark (ii. 1, etc.), and St. Luke (v. 18, etc.). All the Synoptists call attention to the fact that Jesus worked this miracle to prove that *the Son of God hath power on earth to forgive sins.* All three, moreover, note our Blessed Lord's closing words: *Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thy house.*

It is something more than a coincidence that after the discourse with the Samaritan women and men on Penance a miracle is recorded which ends with the words, *Arise, take up thy bed, and walk* (v. 8).

As if to make the coincidence still more striking, our Blessed Lord, having (sought and) found the man, *said unto him, Behold, thou art made whole; sin no more, lest a worse thing befall thee* (14). This reference to the man's sin is paralleled with *Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven* (Matt. ix. 4).

Chapter VI.—Holy Eucharist.

The series of sacraments leads naturally to the dramatic scenes and sayings of the sixth chapter.

1. It should be noted that the only direct reference the Synoptists make to the Holy Eucharist are the words of institution at the Last Supper. This is all the more remarkable, because all three had given a detailed account of the miracle and explanation of Penance.

2. St. John's Gospel calls attention to the fact that in broaching the idea of the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist Jesus had used the same method as in broaching the sacrament of Penance.

(*a*) He had wrought a miracle. In the case of Penance it was (1) a miracle of curing bodily sickness at a distance, but of short duration (iv. 46); (2) not at a distance, but of long duration (v. 2). In the case of the Blessed Eucharist it was the significant miracle of multiplying food (vi. 4-13).

(*b*) When the first outlines of the sacrament are met by difficulties, He enters into a defence or explanation (vi. 42, 53; Matt. ix. 3, etc.).

3. To the despair of the exegete in search of an exact chronology, St. John combines this scene with St. Peter's profession of faith in Jesus. By this combination St. Peter's words are seen to be a profession of faith in the Holy Eucharist.

4. In the closing words of the sixth chapter is given a subsidiary study of St. Peter's profession of faith and Judas's betrayal. Both are coupled with the Holy Eucharist.

Matthew.	John.
xvi. 16. And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. . . .	vi. 68. Simon Peter answered Him. . . . 69. And we have believed and know that Thou art the Holy One of God.
23. But He turned and said unto Peter, Get thee behind Me, Satan.	71. Jesus answered them, Did not I choose you the twelve, and one of you is a devil? 72. Now He spake of Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot.

This subsidiary study on one who approached the Holy Eucharist unworthily by betraying his Master is a fitting close of the Eucharist drama.

(Chapter XII. 1-8.—Extreme Unction?)

We have put this reference between brackets and with a note of interrogation because we do not suggest that there is here any very detailed doctrine on the sacrament of the Last Anointing. Yet St. John's Gospel is so evidently related to the contemporary development in doctrine and ritual that it would be hard to deny some reference to the sacrament. At any rate, St. John is careful to recall that there was one anointing which was not primarily directed towards bodily healing, but towards bodily death. In his days, as in our own, this lesson was not superfluous.

Vincent McNabb, O.P.

REVIEWS

THE BOOK OF JOB: By the late S. R. Driver, D.D., and G. Buchanan Gray, D.Litt. International Critical Commentary Series. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1921. 35s. net.

AN old fellow-pupil of Dr. Gray's can imagine how eagerly Dr. Driver himself would have approved the way in which his own work has been completed—with the exact scholarship, the sobriety of judgment, the endeavour to make the best of the text before emending it, the use of copious illustration, which his teaching made familiar to us. Dr. Gray has caught the method to perfection, and he has carried it a stage farther than perhaps Dr. Driver would have done, as we shall see presently.

Each scholar's share in the production of this important work is tabulated in the Preface. Briefly it may be said that Dr. Driver wrote most of the philological notes, and Dr. Gray most of the commentary proper; the former contributed about two-thirds of the translation, the latter the whole of the Introduction. Two changes have been made in the familiar form of these commentaries. The text in a fresh translation is printed at the top of the page; and the philological notes are given consecutively and at length in the second part of the book. Both changes will be welcomed. The second in particular has the advantage of doing full justice to the Hebrew, which in the case of Job requires much detailed explanation, while it relieves the commentary from a mass of notes in small type, distracting to the student of the English version.

Job is a difficult book, and the difficulty of it lies chiefly in following the sequence of thought. The Western mind is at first bewildered by the absence of anything like an orderly argument in what professes to be the discussion of a theoretical problem. An ancient Oriental poet, however, thinks in pictures, symbolically, and pursues an inward logic of his own; it must be remembered, too, that the Hebrew of the Old Testament, while admirably adapted to the use of a poet or prophet, was not a convenient medium for metaphysical discussion. In such an argument, therefore, as that of Job, the author writes as a poet, and leaves much to the imagination: the reader is expected to supply links and develop hints, and change position rapidly from one or other of the opposing sides. The present commentary has the great merit of making the sequence of thought intelligible; no obscurity is shirked in the attempt to guide the reader through the maze.

The other main difficulty of Job arises out of the state of the text. Not only is the language highly wrought, but corrupt forms and readings abound, while a good many interpolations have been introduced throughout the poem. These last can be detected sometimes by a comparison of the Greek version. Now the LXX of Job is shorter than the Hebrew by nearly 400 *stichoi*. Which is the nearer to the original? On the whole we may believe that the Hebrew of Job, as we have it in our Bibles, represents an earlier text than that which lay before the Greek translators; but even then, to arrive at the original form of the book, we have to subtract the Elihu chapters (xxxii.-xxxvii.), the Poem on Wisdom (xxviii.), and the second Speech of Yahweh (xl. 6–xli. 34 [26]), which are undoubtedly later insertions. Hence neither the existing Hebrew nor the Greek version actually represents the original as it came from the author. But there is another means by which additions to the text can sometimes be discovered—the application of metrical canons; and it is in his handling of this method, still a comparatively new one, that Dr. Gray seems to us to have advanced the criticism of Job a stage farther, and in the right direction. An interpolated passage generally betrays itself by a lack of metrical form—that is to say, by the incongruity of its rhythm and by imperfect parallelism. Applying this standard, Dr. Gray is able to offer some hopeful emendations (*e.g.*, xvi. 7 *f.*, xvii. 14, xviii. 2, xxx. 16 *f.*, xxxix. 3). The metrical experiments of his predecessors have taught him what pitfalls to avoid and what principles may safely be enforced.

In approaching the theme of the book, we must bear in mind that both Job and his friends take for granted the current explanation of suffering as an evidence of Divine displeasure, a punishment of sin: they claim, in fact—at any rate the friends claim—to understand God's way of ruling the universe and ordering the lives of men. The friends uphold the theory through thick and thin, even to the extent of telling lies to defend it; but to Job it brings torture, and almost wrecks his faith. For as against the friends, the theory is untrue to the facts: he denies that he has committed so much sin as to deserve so much punishment; while as against God, it drives him to accuse God of injustice, it contradicts all that he had learnt of God through past experience of fellowship and trust. Thus Job is at issue with his friends and at issue with himself. He is forced into the strange attitude of appealing from God, his unjust persecutor, to God whom he had been accustomed to consider as his friend (xvi. 20-22, xvii. 3, xix. 25-27, xxxi. 35-37). Rightly understood, there is a nobility in the soul's demand that God shall be just as well as mighty. Something of the same kind occurs

in Euripides, especially in the famous passage of the *Troades* (ll. 884-889), where Hecuba, disdaining to "call on things so weak" as the gods of popular religion, invokes a Power or Providence which, she feels, must lie behind them: "Thou deep Base of the World, and thou high Throne Above the World, whoe'er thou art."

The whole trouble had arisen from an inadequate and unworthy idea of God; the remedy, so the author believed, could only be found by deepening and enlarging the idea. In this he shows true religious insight. He has no theory of his own to put forward in place of that which had broken down under the debate; his aim is not to solve the problem of suffering, but to justify the ways of God by insisting upon a truer conception of His Being: that is the point of the Speech of Yahweh (xxxviii. 2–xl. 2). At the same time the author wishes to maintain the worth of human nature as against a shallow observation of the facts of life; accordingly Job's longing to be at peace with God is satisfied; he repents of his hasty words and unworthy views; he recovers the experience of the past, and he has gone deeper: "By the hearing of the ear I had heard of thee, but now mine eye hath seen thee" (xl. 4, 5+xlii. 2-6). It is a return to the religious temper: Job has found God. But for its suffering, the soul would never make its way there.

The Epilogue strikes the modern mind as a descent from this lofty climax. But Dr. Gray makes the just remark that, after Job's character had been proved, and his disinterestedness established, "there was no reason why the story should end with the sufferings inflicted for a particular purpose made perpetual after the purpose had been achieved."

The Book of Job is a magnificent work of literature, as of religion, and we need assistance if we are to understand it properly. But the study of such a commentary as this leaves one with the desire to read the great poem afresh, without a gloss of any kind, simply for its art and the story of a soul's adventure: almost inevitably the text loses something of its bloom under the rigour of the annotation. Not that we feel anything but gratitude for the present work, probably the most thorough treatment of Job in existence. It has not the brilliant originality of Duhm's commentary, or Budde's, nor the pungency of Davidson's, nor the style and religious fervour of Peake's; but in weight of judgment and masterly scholarship it cannot be surpassed.

Dr. Gray no doubt has his reasons, yet he apparently ignores the affinity of Job to the Suffering Servant in the Second Isaiah and Ps. xxii. Job, of course, has an individual, as distinct

from a national, significance: he does not stand for Israel; nevertheless, the typically good man who endures a typically hard fate is a representative figure, and the poet who created him writes from a background of misery and disorder. On the supposed Babylonian source of Job we agree with Dr. Gray in his scepticism; he hardly does justice, however, to the remarkable likeness of the Hebrew to the Babylonian poem. When a more complete text of the latter comes to light we shall be able to judge whether there is anything beyond a striking resemblance between them.

We have noticed a few misprints. In Part I., p. 74, third line from below, G (=Greek), ought surely to be H (=Hebrew); p. 202, the numeral 9 is missing from the translation. In Part II., pp. 43, 55, 324 the Syriac, and on p. 70 (below) the Hebrew, is incorrectly printed.

G. A. Cooke.

Walter de Wenlok: Abbot of Westminster. By Ernest Harold Pearce, Litt.D., F.S.A., Bishop of Worcester. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1920. Demy 8vo. Pp. vii + 236. Price 12s.

During the period of his canonry at Westminster Dr. Pearce had fortunate opportunities of making himself well acquainted with the Muniment Room of the Abbey, and he first turned them to good account in his monograph on William de Colchester, an abbot of the fourteenth century. His present work is of greater compass, and deals with a more notable man, Walter de Wenlok, who was Abbot of Westminster from 1284 to 1307. It is a truly excellent book, of the sort dear to the heart of the archæologist, and a valuable contribution to the ecclesiastical history of the period with which it deals. Walter de Wenlok, a monk of Westminster, was elected as successor to Abbot Richard de Ware on December 31, 1283, and about three weeks later he set out for Rome to obtain the Papal confirmation of his election. Dr. Pearce gives some highly interesting details of the cost of the journey, and particulars of the borrowing of money by the new Abbot and his party from a banking firm in Siena. More money had to be borrowed at Orvieto, where the Pope, Martin IV., was then in residence—a good deal of money had been expended before Abbot Walter, duly confirmed in his rights, was free to leave Rome for Westminster. He was back at the Abbey in June, 1284, and by the end of that month had received his temporalities from the King, by August the store of silver plate which belonged to his office, and by November an account of the stewardship of his estates

during the time which had elapsed since the death of his predecessor. All this is interesting as showing that in those days it took the best part of a year to settle an Abbot of Westminster in his high place; in connection with this particular election, Dr. Pearce records a highly notable fact—namely, that when Abbot Walter was chosen, Edward I., instead of following the custom of his predecessors, and seizing the previous Abbot's corn, sheep, oxen, horses, silver, jewels, books, and treasure, granted them to the incoming Abbot and his successors; a little later he gave the Abbot and monks of Westminster a further important privilege in freeing them of all exactions of toll between Dover and Calais, and at all bridges, waters, and roads throughout the kingdom.

This last privilege may seem a small one; it was in reality a very great one. Walter de Wenlok, as Abbot of Westminster, did much travelling. In *Mun.* 24490 there is a record of a progress which he made in the autumn of 1286 through his manors in the Eastern Counties and the Midlands. It took him into Hertfordshire, Essex, the South Midlands, and back through Surrey. In the following year he was at Pershore, Malvern, and Bourton. All through his abbatial career he travelled much; that travelling from one manor to another was a necessity of his office is proved by the fact that in August, 1285, Pope Honorius IV. granted to him a faculty for a portable altar—a privilege which, says Dr. Pearce, meant much to a man whose official life was one of perpetual motion. It could hardly be otherwise. An Abbot of Westminster in those days seems to have been not so much a monk as a man of business. He had estates in various parts of the country—Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Gloucestershire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Surrey; there were more nearer London, at Laleham, Staines, Yeoveney, notably at Denham, near Uxbridge, where the Abbots had a great country house; it was not only necessary for him to visit these—his own portion of the Westminster properties—but to pay periodical visits to those other estates which belonged to the convent. All this meant money, and Dr. Pearce tells us a great deal about Wenlok's money affairs. He often found himself poor amidst his riches, yet there is no reason to accuse him of extravagance; he was wise in his purchases, and allowed no expenditure without his warrant. But he was frequently in debt, and to all sorts of people, even "to John, his servant, £1 5s. 7½d." Now and then he makes an effort to pay off some of his creditors—he orders £53 6s. 8d. to be paid to some merchants of Siena "for an old debt"; £10 to Juliana, wife of Thomas Romayn, money which he had borrowed from her; £26 13s. 4d. to his tailor, and so on. These financial matters

are somewhat hard to understand, for that Wenlok could find money at a given moment appears from the fact that in 1291 he ordered full and immediate payment of debts amounting to £274 15s. 11½d.—no inconsiderable sum. Nevertheless, we often find him resorting to the pawnbroker with his jewels, and the only conclusion we can come to is that if there was anything that really was wanting in the later Middle Ages it was a sound banking system.

It was during the abbacy of Walter de Wenlok that the famous burglary of the Royal Treasury at Westminster happened; Dr. Pearce devotes a highly interesting chapter to it, which should be read in conjunction with Professor Tout's paper, "A Mediæval Burglary," published in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* five years ago. The monks of Westminster fell into serious trouble in this affair—originally ten of them (one of whom, John de Prestcote, was probably not a monk) were arrested; later, according to a royal mandate, the Abbot himself and forty-eight monks were implicated, and a thorough investigation of the whole matter was held at the Tower just after the Feast of the Epiphany in 1304. The whole thing is a curious business. One Richard de Podelicote, a merchant in cheese and butter, ultimately confessed that he alone was responsible for the burglary, which he effected to recoup himself for certain loans. Dr. Pearce characterizes this man's confession as "a straightforward story, which merely lacks any probability." As for the supposed guilt of the monks, "certainly," says Dr. Pearce, "the monks were not enriched by the burglary either individually or as a body." He thinks their inculpation was due, less to their actual guilt than to the hostility of Reginald de Hadham, who subsequently figured in the equally famous case Hadham *v.* Wenlok, to which he also devotes an entire chapter. That case, into which we need not go, arose from the principal defect in Abbot Wenlok's character; in spite of his ceaseless and great care of the Abbey estates, and the welfare of the community, Wenlok was unfortunate in his relations with a certain section of his brethren, and the last years of his rule were marked by a personal quarrel which split the convent into two bitterly disagreeing factions. The record of those years is not pleasant; it is one of sordid money matters, leading to acrimonious litigation; far more pleasant are the human touches of which Dr. Pearce gives us plenty in his accounts of Wenlok's relations with his old mother, whom, when he was first elected to his great station, he brought up from her far-away country home to see him in his magnificence, and whom he treated with a deference and honour that prove him to have been a good man and a worthy Christian.

J. S. Fletcher.

NOTICES

FROM RITUAL TO ROMANCE. By Jessie L. Weston. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, 1920. One vol. Pp. 202. 12s. 6d. net.

After upwards of thirty years' steady and persevering study of the Grail texts, Miss Weston has come to the conclusion that neither the theory of Christian origin nor that of a folklore source explains all the elements in the legend. Fresh from the study of *The Golden Bough*, she was struck by the resemblance existing between certain features of the Grail story and characteristic details of the Nature cults described. The more closely she analyzed the tale, the more striking became the resemblance, and finally she was led to ask whether the mysterious legend might not have "the confused record of a ritual, once popular, later surviving under conditions of strict secrecy"? She is probably correct in contending that the Celtic elements have been exaggerated by Nutt and his school, although it must be acknowledged that such symbols and features as the Fisher King, the Waste Land, the Lance, the Sword, and the Grail itself, whether Cup or Dish, are by no means unknown to Celtic folklore. The notion of quests for objects of magical significance, and of a king surrounded by Champions, plays a conspicuous part in Gaelic tradition. It would therefore be difficult to deny Celtic influence in the formation of the Grail story, although Miss Weston may be correct in affirming that "a path that leads but into a Celtic twilight can only be a by-path, and not the King's Highway!" Similarly, the influence of Christian thought and tradition probably has a larger part in the legend than she is prepared to allow. This has been clearly demonstrated by Miss M. A. Murray in two articles contributed to *Ancient Egypt* (1916, Parts I. and II.), in which she suggests an Egyptian origin for the Joseph of Arimathea legend and a Coptic origin for the Grail. To these Miss Weston does not refer.

Nevertheless, the persistent feature of the wasted land, restored to fertility in conjunction with the king's restoration to health, the marked parallels with elements in the cult of Adonis and Tammuz, and other vegetation ritual, suggest that behind the Celtic and Christian aspects of the legend there is the shadowy form of primitive fertility ritual. An early vegetation cult may well have survived on the Welsh highlands, strongly influenced by Celtic tradition, which later became fused with Christian and Oriental elements. Be this as it may, ritual invariably precedes romance in primitive cult, the desire to act discharging itself on the symbol. By rites emotions are re-enacted, and the emotion strongest in primitive man is *the will to live*. It therefore follows that hunting and vegetation ritual is one of the fundamental aspects of primitive religion and magic.

While many scholars will hesitate before accepting any single explanation of the whole body of traditions clustering round the Grail story, it will be generally admitted that Miss Weston's book throws new light on an old problem. For the theologian it is full of interest and suggestion, inasmuch as it shows that union with the Source of Life is the agelong

quest of man. As Miss Weston truly remarks, Christianity is but a "fulfilment of the promise enshrined in the mysteries from the beginning of the world"; a statement which is but the echo of Illingworth in *Lux Mundi*, "The pre-Christian religions were the agelong prayer, the Incarnation was the answer."

E. O. James.

The Old Testament Conception of Atonement fulfilled by Christ; with a Criticism of Dr. Rashdall's Bampton Lectures. By Rev. Prof. C. F. Burney, D.Litt. Oxford University Press. 1s. net.

Three Sermons on the Atonement. By Arthur C. Headlam, D.D. S.P.C.K.

These two pamphlets of sermons on the Atonement are complementary to one another. Professor Burney lays down the foundation of Christian doctrine and Dr. Headlam confirms and then builds upon it a structure of practical Christianity.

The carefulness of the workmanship of Professor Burney's sermon, which is constructive in character, is guaranteed by the fact that it was preached before the University of Oxford with the avowed object of criticizing the Bampton Lectures of a great living scholar.

In the first part, after urging the importance of New Testament students having some first-hand knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic, if they are rightly to interpret its relation to Old Testament prophecy, Professor Burney challenges the modern view that the Prophets were only "*forth-tellers*" and not "*fore-tellers*" also. Limiting himself in the application of this thesis to its bearing upon those passages of the Deutero-Isaiah which depict the suffering Servant of Yahweh, he proceeds to give his reasons for belief in their definitely "*fore-telling*" character. After a summary of Isa. xl-lv, in which he fully endorses the view that the suffering Servant is *primarily* an impersonization of the nation called by God to the evangelization of the world, he places himself among those who feel themselves compelled by "the boldness of the lines in which the Servant is depicted *as an individual*" to find the fulfilment of the prophecy in our Lord.

He goes on to argue from various passages in the New Testament that our Lord recognized, and from the beginning of His ministry applied to Himself, the Messianic import of the suffering Servant passages in Isaiah. This theme is worked out in a way calling for careful consideration in connection with Dr. Rashdall's argument that such an interpretation would be impossible, since it would involve—(1) our Lord's adoption of views contrary to the Messianic ideas of His time, and (2) an immoral conception of the Divine character.

In the second part of the sermon, after summarizing Dr. Rashdall's theory of the Atonement, and stating that his objection to any objective theory seems due to the idea that all such theories must necessarily be irrational or immoral, Professor Burney goes on to argue that Dr. Rashdall is mistaken in thinking St. Paul's doctrine to be "a theory of vicarious, or substituted punishment," and that this mistake is due to the fact that "his conception of sacrifice is radically incorrect." He then gives his own conception of the right view of Levitical sacrifice, in which he em-

phasizes the fact that there was no idea of substitutionary punishment involved in the sacrifice of the victim, and that the offering typified a perfectly sinless life accepted " in place of the imperfect life of the worshipper." He concludes by noting Dr. Rashdall's failure to note St. Paul's teaching on the mystical union involved in baptism as filling an important place in his teaching on the Atonement.

The sermon is of considerable doctrinal value both in its bearing upon the nature of Old Testament prophecy, and on the Atonement. There is an obvious misprint on p. 12 (" live " for " give "), and in connection with the military illustration on p. 9 the assumption that none question the justice of a world-order which requires heroic suffering is a questionable one. We note that one of Dr. Headlam's sermons deals with this matter as being of practical importance.

Dr. Burney's note on the Day of Atonement taken in conjunction with his references to St. Paul's mystical teaching on Christian baptism suggest an interesting possibility. On the Day of Atonement the laying of the high priest's hand with confession upon its head symbolized the transference of the guilt of the nation to the goat Azazel. This suggests the possibility that in the sin-offering the laying-on of the worshipper's hand signified not only dedication to God, as Dr. Burney says; but also the mystical " connection " of the offerer's life with that of the sacrifice (Westcott), so that, cleansed by union with the " most holy " victim, it was offered to, and accepted by, God in the blood, which is the life, in expiation of his sin. It appears that the remedy for the " immorality of substitution " is mystical union, to which the main objection urged is that " great is the mystery."

Dr. Headlam's sermons are of that persuasive kind consisting of exhortation based upon scholarship. Whilst insisting upon the perfect humanity of our Lord with all the limitations involved, he yet urges, with Professor Burney, that Jesus saw Himself from the beginning both as " the consummation of the sacrificial system of the old law " and also " as the Messiah, the Son of God," Who was " to bear the sin of many," and win the world to the true God. This conception of Himself, though definitely stated in only few texts, is yet involved " in the whole character of His teaching," so that " to cut out the idea of atonement from the Gospel narrative " is to deprive it " of everything which gives it real and logical consistency." With this as his basis Dr. Headlam is able to show that suffering is necessary to the development of every lofty character, and that this is true even of the Divine nature.

The second sermon teaches that the Atonement meets a real need of the human heart, and is a revelation of that " sacrifice [which] is an attribute of the Almighty "; whilst in the third he shows that the true meaning of the triumph which comes through suffering is " opportunity for further service," and that this is what our recent victory is calling us to.

It is a little difficult to see in what exact sense it can be said that " sacrifice " rather than the capacity for, and experience of it, " is an attribute of the Almighty," or is " part of the Divine nature," but the meaning is sufficiently clear.

These sermons illustrate excellently how to make doctrine the best basis for practical Christianity, and afford useful support to those who still find objective theories of the Atonement to be the more inspiring.

P. L. Snowden.

THE GOSPEL IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. By C. F. Burney, D.Litt. T. and T. Clark. 12s.

This new volume in *The Scholar as Preacher* series deserves a warm welcome. It is arguable that a scholar in the technical sense cannot be a good preacher, that the mental discipline necessary to keep a man in the front ranks of research almost always disqualifies him from diagnosing the spiritual needs of an ordinary congregation. Certainly these admirable sermons, in spite of their latent religious fervour and simplicity of diction, are too academic for the average parish church. But the book is of the highest value as a guide to the preacher who wishes to use the Old Testament, or to the layman anxious to know how far its religious appeal has been affected by modern criticism.

Many of the sermons allude to the vicissitudes of the Allies' Cause during the war. Whether these topical references should have been retained or not is a matter of opinion. Few preachers, however, confronted to-day with all their war sermons, would find so little that they would prefer to have been expressed otherwise.

Dr. Burney confines himself to the generally accepted results of criticism and eschews mere theories. It is reassuring to find the author of the massive commentary on Judges adopting a relatively conservative attitude on many disputed points. We pick a few out of many interesting passages. The name Jahveh is explained as meaning *I will become what I will become :* " No words can adequately sum up all that Jehovah *will become* to His chosen people." The difference between the implied conception of God and the characteristic conception of ethnic religions is very great. The preacher points out that the great prophecy of Immanuel in Isa. vii. implies a virgin-birth. The birth itself is represented as out of the ordinary, and certainly the Septuagint translator interpreted the young woman as being a virgin. An interesting sermon on the proposed expurgated psalter for public worship decides against it, though with some hesitation, largely on the ground that the imprecatory psalms are valuable in time of war. Abraham's temptation to sacrifice Isaac is used to illustrate our Lord's Agony in the Garden; a good example of spiritual exegesis of the Old Testament.

Is it hypercitical to object to the conclusion drawn from 1 Sam. xxv. 19, " They have driven me out this day that I should not cleave unto the heritage of Jehovah, saying, Go, worship other Gods " ? " Here the underlying thought in David's mind is that if he is driven outside Jehovah's heritage—His land—he is thereby precluded from the worship of Jehovah." It may have been so, though he would be a bold man who claimed to analyze David's mental processes with accuracy, but all the passage says is that *others* said this to David. As it stands it does not preclude the view that the higher minds in Israel believed in Jehovah as Lord of the whole earth, and that the prophets were not innovators in this respect.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE LIFE OF CHRIST. By the Rev. G. Robinson Lees, B.A. Pp. xvi+531. London: Partridge and Co., Ltd.

The author's claim for writing this book is based less upon scholarship than upon an intimate knowledge of life in Palestine. His book reflects this. There is nothing which calls for special notice in his treatment of the theme; but he has certainly set the life of Christ into a background which is real and living. In a sense the story of the Ministry lives again, since

the little details of dress, scenery, habits, and customs are used to stimulate the imagination of the reader. The book is of more value as an historical geography of the Holy Land than as a strictly scientific study of the life of Christ. It is a book full of real charm for the imaginative reader, but just lacking in that depth which would commend it to the serious student. It is only fair to say that Mr. Lees disclaims any real intention to write for scholars. For such he merely claims, and justly, that they will need the evidence of the Holy Land as much as that of their documents, if they are to study aright the gospel story. Mr. Lees has written for that much wider circle of readers who desire to know the conditions under which Christ lived, and whose devotion to Him is stirred most easily and fruitfully by an appeal to the imagination. Congratulations are due to the author, who, amidst the exacting claims of parochial life, has written such a *magnum opus*—" the supreme effort of my life."

THE FOUR GOSPELS: THEIR LITERARY HISTORY AND THEIR SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS. By the Rev. Maurice Jones, D.D. S.P.C.K. 1921. Pp. vi+122. 6s. net.

THE VISIONS OF ST. PAUL AND THE GREAT ATONEMENT. By the Rev. T. L. Williams, B.A. Skeffington, London. 1921. Pp. 279. 10s. 6d. net.

WHAT DID CHRIST TEACH ABOUT DIVORCE? By F. H. Chase, D.D., Bishop of Ely. S.P.C.K. 1921. Pp. 64. 1s. 6d. net.

Dr. Jones's study of the Four Gospels puts before the reader, in a delightfully simple way, the results of recent criticism. A preliminary chapter turns the attention of the reader to problems affecting the Gospel narratives as a whole: questions of how, why, and when the Gospels came to be written, their chronological order, and a perfectly admirable section dealing with the intricacies of the Synoptic Problem. For this exposition alone the book would be well worth its price. Each of the three Synoptic Gospels is treated in a separate chapter, and Dr. Jones is at pains to show how the different purpose and outlook of each evangelist are reflected in his pages. A sympathetic and equally scholarly treatment is accorded to St. John's Gospel in the last two chapters of this book. If only we could have courses of sermons or lectures similar to that contained in this book in every church in England, we should all be immensely benefited—clergy and people alike.

Mr. Williams has set himself to discover, in the first part of his book, the substance of those visions and unspeakable words which St. Paul both saw and heard, and of which he tells us in the second Epistle to the Corinthian Church. Mr. Williams takes the expression of the Apostle that the words he heard were " not lawful for any man to utter " and by trying to discover *lacunæ* in the scheme of Pauline theology concludes that the subjects on which St. Paul is silent, or tongue-tied, formed part of his supernatural experience. Side by side with this line of argument Mr. Williams concludes that so indelibly must these visions and locutions have been impressed on the mind of the Apostle that they must have coloured his whole subsequent outlook on life. Between these two stools Mr. Williams looks for the material of his visions. Is it to be wondered at that he is sometimes in danger of falling? Thus he concludes that the " end of the ungodly " was one of the visions which St. Paul saw. It is obvious that the author, by reason of the extraordinary difficulty of his subject, must occasionally depend more on ingenuity than scholarship.

The most we can say of this part of the book is that it is suggestive. The second part of the book deals with the foundation of Christian unity, which the author believes to be the Apostolic succession. He brings forward a *catena* of authorities from the earliest times to the present day in order to support his main contention. The conclusion to which he comes is as follows: "The fact must be boldly put forward that the central source of Apostolic succession is in the priesthood. . . . No ordination takes place to the priesthood without the joint laying on of hands—the bishop and priests. The bishop is one of them, the chief priest, *primus inter pares*." In an Appendix is given a translation of Gregory's letter to John of Constantinople (A.D. 594-595).

The Bishop of Ely has collected and expanded the evidence which he gave before the Royal Commission on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes in 1910. This small but valuable pamphlet is an effective answer to Dr. Charles's Westminster sermon published in *the Guardian* of June 25, 1920, and to the latter's more recent book, *The Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce*.

THE ETHIOPIC DIDASCALIA. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by J. M. Harden, B.D., LL.D. S.P.C.K. 1920. Price 9s.

Bishop John Wordsworth, in his *Ministry of Grace*, that obscurely-named history of Christian origins and development, spoke of the Didascalia as the name given to the old basis of the first seven books of the Apostolical Constitutions which is found in Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic, and, to some extent, in Latin. This old basis, or earliest form of such a work, was undoubtedly written in Greek, actual words of this language being used in the Syriac, Ethiopic, and Latin; and it seems to have been composed at a date between A.D. 200 and 250, probably in Syria or Palestine. The name of the book, Didascalia, means teaching from an active point of view rather than doctrine from a passive standpoint, if distinction may be drawn between the two words, and Didakhé be reserved for the latter. Thus this Didascalia cannot be regarded as a Church Order or collection of Canons, but more as a homily on Church life and society; and it appears in its present versions as instruction given by the twelve Apostles to the Bishop of every diocese. More than 100 years later, about A.D. 375, the Pseudo-Ignatius is believed to have used this earlier discourse or homily in compiling the eight books of the Apostolical Constitutions, representing the rules and customs of the Church of Antioch, in the first chapter of which occur the words: "Hear ye teaching (didaskalian) sacred (hieran)." The word here used points to the origin of the work. There is no trace of the eighth of these books in the extant so-called Didascalia, but for the seven books we have correspondent material in all the versions.

Dr. Harden has given us a full translation of the Ethiopic version for the first time in the series of early Christian texts by S.P.C.K. The former edition by Platt for the Asiatic Translation Fund, though producing an Ethiopic text, and regarded by the unwary as complete, depended on a manuscript which broke off in the twenty-third chapter, while the full work extends to forty-three. By study of the present volume scholars will be able to decide whether we have now sufficient information, or whether a critical edition of the Ethiopic is required.

The analysis given in the short Introduction indicates the close relation of the Ethiopic version to the first seven books of the Constitutions. One omission of eleven chapters in the seventh book represents

the chief material point of difference; and it is suggested by the editor upon good ground that an earlier version of the Ethiopic contained these chapters, which would have given instruction about the Eucharist, preceding the passage which treats of Baptism and Unction.

In regard to the Ethiopic, the Arabic is of importance, and it seems clear that there are two Arabic recensions. One of these, preserved by a manuscript recently discovered in the Museo Borgiano in Rome, contains a text which corresponds almost exactly to the Ethiopic, and gives the valuable information that it was translated from Coptic by Abu Ishaq (Ibn Assal) in 1295, at a time of well-known literary activity in Cairo. Other Arabic manuscripts agree in giving a different form, suggesting that there were two independent versions in Lower Egypt. It should be noticed that, as in other cases, the Ethiopic reaches us through the Arabic, and not through the Coptic directly. Before, therefore, pronouncing finally upon the Ethiopic, we may look for new light which might come from a critical edition of the Arabic. At present two Syriac printed texts have been published, but no scholar has yet taken in hand the other important version. We have only a description of the one manuscript alluded to above.

Full praise must be given to the translator of the Ethiopic. The work has been done very carefully, and an exact collation of the chapters given by Platt bears witness to the diligence bestowed. Two small points call for some notice. Dr. Harden remarks on the ambiguity of the expression for God, which is a compound form denoting lord of earth (or world), usually representing God (*θεός*), but also Lord (*κύριος*). In one passage it has been translated Lord, and thereby gives the impression that the Greek text in Acts xx. 28, translated by the Ethiopic, read Church of the *Lord*, and not Church of *God*. A less important point is where he translates Holy Apostolic Church as if there was a recognized adjectival form for Apostolic, whereas the words are *according to Apostles*.

It may be interesting to add two examples of the parallel versions. Apost. Const., v. 7, 7 (Funk): *πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἕτερα περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως εἴρηται καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν δικαίων ἐν δόξῃ διαμονῆς καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν ἀσεβῶν τιμωρίας.* Latin (Hauler): Multa quidem et alia (tam) per Iesaiam quam et per alios prophetas dicta sunt de resurrectione et vita permanente in gloria iustorum et de impiis similiter et infamia. Syriac (Gibson): And again, he hath spoken by means of Isaiah and all other prophets about the resurrection and eternal life, and about the glory of the righteous, and about the shame and destruction of sinners. Ethiopic (Harden): He hath told us much concerning the resurrection from the dead and [their] abode in life eternal, which is full of grace and truth, which he hath prepared for those that love him, and [concerning] the judgment of the ungodly.

Apost. Const., vi. 7, 3: *πάντων δὲ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τούτῳ ταραχθέντων ἀτενίσας ἐγὼ πέτρος εἰς τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ κακοῦργον ὄφιν εἶπον τῷ σίμωνι.* Latin (Hauler): Sed cum omnes in hoc moti fuissemus intendens petrus ad propinquum simonis diabolum dixit. Syriac (Gibson): And we were all shaken about this. Then Peter looked at Satan, him who dwelt in Simon, and said to him. Ethiopic (Harden): Then we feared, and were troubled. And when I saw, I, Peter, this evil deed, I said unto Simon. Dr. Harden's MS. 752 reads plainly: *I having seen*, and not *we*, etc.

G. HORNER.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER